

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, January 28, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of Infinite Love, Thou who are so patient to listen and so willing to hear, do Thou consider us and permit us to go forth to-day with Thy benediction; keep us in the mood of courageous faith and high purpose. Whatever may be the problems, lead the way, and enable us to press on with willing hands and patient hearts. We do most gratefully praise the One who is constantly blessing us. Direct all the interests of our country and all who are in authority. Remember our President and Speaker and all others upon whom rest the responsibility and function of government. In every way glorify Thyself through us, and Thine shall be the praise forever. In the holy name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 25, 1929, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be respectfully requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 4222) entitled "An act to authorize the creation of Indian trust estates, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2362) entitled "An act to authorize the payment to Robert Toquothty of royalties arising from an oil and gas well in the bed of the Red River, Okla."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4338) entitled "An act to authorize the President to award, in the name of Congress, gold medals of appropriate design to Albert C. Read, Elmer F. Stone, Walter Hinton, H. C. Rodd, J. L. Breese, and Eugene Rhodes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate in the enrollment of S. 4338, to amend the title.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Michael J. Fraher;
- H. R. 2098. An act for the relief of Alonzo Northrup;
- H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of John G. DeCamp;
- H. R. 4589. An act for the relief of Dan A. Morrison;
- H. R. 8341. An act to provide for appointing Clarence Ulery a warrant officer, United States Army;
- H. R. 12113. An act providing for the acquirement by the United States of privately owned lands situated within certain townships in the Lincoln National Forest, in the State of New Mexico by exchanging therefor lands on the public domain also within such State;
- H. R. 12995. An act for the relief of Etta B. Leach Johnson;
- H. R. 14150. An act to amend section 279 of the Judicial Code;
- H. R. 14925. An act to authorize repayment of certain excess amounts paid by purchasers of lots in the town sites of Bowdoin, Mont., and for other purposes; and
- H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution authorizing the President under certain conditions to invite the participation of other nations in the Chicago World's Fair, providing for the admission of their exhibits, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 6496. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Oklahoma with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Cimarron River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;
- H. R. 6497. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian or Red Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;
- H. R. 6499. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Arizona with respect to the division and apportionment of the

waters of the Gila and San Francisco Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 7024. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, San Juan, and Las Animas Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 7025. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, Oklahoma, and Kansas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 7200. An act to amend section 321 of the Penal Code;

H. R. 7409. An act for the relief of John J. Campbell;

H. R. 13097. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Moore; and

H. R. 13484. An act authorizing preliminary examinations of sundry streams with a view to the control of their floods, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4517. An act appropriating tribal funds of Indians residing on the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., to pay expenses of the general council and business committee, and for other purposes;

S. 4704. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the advisability and practicability of establishing a national park to be known as the Tropical Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

S. 4890. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Gallup Undertaking Co. for burial of four Navajo Indians;

S. 5014. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to the city of Bozeman, Mont., a patent to certain public lands;

S. 5073. An act to amend the act of Congress of June 26, 1906, entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes";

S. 5090. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Easterly;

S. 5095. An act to amend section 1, rule 3, subdivision (e), of an act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, enacted February 8, 1895, as amended May 17, 1928;

S. 5178. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to donate to the city of Oakland, Calif., the United States Coast Guard cutter *Bear*;

S. 5179. An act to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

S. 5181. An act to amend section 4 of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. p. 224; sec. 341, title 22, U. S. C.);

S. 5269. An act to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the Black Hills and Harney National Forests;

S. 5331. An act for the relief of Edwina R. Munchhof;

S. 5452. An act to amend the trading with the enemy act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed with the Alien Property Custodian;

S. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inauguration ceremonies in 1929; and

S. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution restricting the Federal Power Commission from issuing or approving any permits or licenses affecting the Colorado River or any of its tributaries, except the Gila River.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3453) entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Clara Percy."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) requesting the President to return to the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) entitled "Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city of New York to enter upon certain United States property for the purpose of constructing a rapid transit railway."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on January 26, 1929, present to the President for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 5953. An act for the relief of E. L. F. Auffurth;
- H. R. 6350. An act for the relief of Bertram Lehman;
- H. R. 6704. An act for the relief of Harry Pincus;

H. R. 7411. An act for the relief of Gilbert Faustina and John Alexander;

H. R. 8988. An act for the relief of Milton Longsdorf;

H. R. 9049. An act to amend section 227 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 9509. An act for the relief of Ray Ernest Smith;

H. R. 10125. An act for the relief of Leo Scheuren;

H. R. 10126. An act for the relief of Loretta Pepper;

H. R. 10974. An act for the relief of Carl Holm;

H. R. 12879. An act to repeal section 1445 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and

H. R. 13144. An act to cede certain lands in the State of Idaho, including John Smiths Lake, to the State of Idaho for fish-cultural purposes, and for other purposes.

IMPORTATION OF SUGAR FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. GARDNER of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement made before the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer and economist, of New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Mr. VILLAMIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the swelling deluge of prophetic words adverse to the Philippines and the fact that I am the last speaker at these hearings for that country, may I suggest that my time be extended to 10 minutes, assuring this committee that I will not add unnecessarily to the verbal tonnage of the day?

The CHAIRMAN. The 5-minute rule will have to be adhered to.

Mr. VILLAMIN. Very well, then. I am going to speak on the broader aspects of the proposition of limiting the importations of sugar from the Philippines to the United States in defiance of the free trade existing between the two countries.

Gentlemen, irrespective of my wishes and aspirations as a Filipino citizen, I believe, as a modest student of international affairs, that the United States is going to stay in the Philippines indefinitely. This assertion finds support in the domain of international realities.

At present the Philippines is the most vulnerable sector on the circumference of America's national defense. Obviously, America's course in the premises is to build up and vitalize the Philippines and convert it into an appreciable asset, politically, economically, strategically.

To accomplish this end two things are essential. First, to be assured of the good will and loyalty of the 12,000,000 Filipinos, which can be realized by vouchsafing to them equitable treatment and equal opportunity under the American flag. Second, to strengthen the Philippines and the Filipinos by developing and utilizing their natural resources.

If the tariff limitation principle, as contemplated in the Timberlake resolution, is adopted, it will effectively stop further economic development in the Philippines. This will embrace not only sugar but all other products as well, including those noncompetitive commodities not produced in continental United States, like rubber, coffee, quinine, fibers, and other tropical raw materials.

Here is an example of what I mean. One of these days that genius, Thomas Edison, may succeed in producing synthetic rubber. In that event Philippine rubber would doubtless be, following the principle of limitation, the subject of a "Timberlake" treatment.

Therefore I say if the restriction theory is established you will have planted a dynamite in the foundation stone of America's international position in the Far East, the very area to which world affairs have gravitated with all their tremendous possibilities.

If the United States, by her vacillation aggravated by equivocation, is not going to permit the development of the Philippines by Americans and Filipinos either separately or conjointly other nations will assume that profitable undertaking. Those islands are too rich in natural resources to remain unnoticed, unmolested, and untouched. The nation that desires most and needs most that opportunity is Japan. Geographical propinquity, inadequate resources, and the actualization of her program of industrialization to meet her problem of overpopulation are the considerations that animate Japan's purposes and plans.

Gentlemen, without sounding any alarm or wagging the tongue of the alarmist, it is indubitable that the resources of the Philippines, including the nearly half a billion tons of iron-ore deposits, under the financial, not to say political, control of Japan would serve powerfully to strengthen Japan's economic sinews and consequently enhance her military power. This fact bears grave connotations to the United States as a power with vital interests in the Pacific that is of the very warp and woof of her national and international policies.

You will therefore have, if you adopt the principle of tariff restriction in your trade relations with the Philippines, surrendered from the armory of American authority the instrument for the destruction of that authority.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the time to refute the arguments of the beet-sugar gentlemen point by point. In a friendly fashion I should

have wished to engage with them in a blow-by-blow debate. I can only say one word now: From the right side of this committee I have listened to the enunciations of the fundamental philosophy of tariff protection, epitomized in guarantees of American market, American labor, American wages, and American equipment. That is all well and good. Official records show, however, that the labor in the beet-sugar industry is inconsequentially American and overwhelmingly Mexican.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is with becoming appropriateness that the first speaker at these hearings for the beet-sugar industry, Mr. Cummings, reechoing in a falsetto voice the protectionist philosophy, really sang the paeans of praise to the Mexican peons. "All hail to the Mexicans; to hell with the Filipinos"—that's exactly what they mean in plain American lingo.

Gentlemen, our agricultural problem is depressing. While our soil yields only 2 tons of sugar an acre that of Louisiana yields 3 tons, Porto Rico 5 tons, and Hawaii, according to the Hawaiian representative who spoke yesterday, yields 6.39 tons.

The Philippines, in 1928, contributed 9 per cent of the sugar consumed in the United States that year. These good people would want you to believe that we could displace them from the United States market. Gentlemen, when Cuba reduced her contribution to the total consumption of the United States in 1928 through a self-imposed restriction by 9 per cent, did the Philippines rush into the lurch to make up for the diminution? Statistics say no. It was the continental beet and cane sugar that took care of that, increasing its percentage in the national consumption from 15 to 21.

This instance demonstrates conclusively the overpowering vitality of the beet and cane sugar industry of the United States. Increased tariff protection will intrench them more strongly and fortify their relative position of strength respecting the sugar that comes from the other side of the globe.

Now, as to profits in sugar. I have the latest fortnightly report of the Manila Stock Exchange. The nine sugar stocks quoted therein averaged less than 17 per cent in dividends paid in 1927, and the mills were the most efficient ones in the Philippines. During that year 60 per cent of the beet-sugar industry paid more than 30 per cent dividends. Is this not significant?

Finally, let us see what this war talk in connection with sugar is all about. They say in case of war sugar supplies can not be brought over from the Philippines. Now, logically, would not this be a good thing for the beet-sugar interests? It would mean, on the one hand, the destruction of the Philippine sugar industry if war shuts off the sea lanes, and, on the other, shortage of supply in the United States and hence higher prices.

The most important thing for America to protect in case of an international emergency is the American flag—American interests, American rights, American prestige. The beet-sugar gentlemen do not seem to have great confidence in the efficacy of the United States Navy to protect American interests overseas. Gentlemen, let me remind you that America's problem of defending the lines of ocean communications between the United States and the Philippines is infinitesimal in comparison with similar problems of England, with which country America, theoretically at least, maintains a naval parity.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. VILLAMIN. May I ask for just one minute more?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman wants a few minutes I think he should have it. What he is saying is not repetition, but new matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman will be extended two minutes.

Mr. VILLAMIN. I was going to say that the consuming power of the United States has a wonderful elasticity. During the World War, by direction of the then Food Administrator, Herbert Hoover, the sugar consumption was reduced by as much as 50 per cent of normal. The United States revealed a tremendous Hooverizing quality. Where, I ask, in view of this formidable truth, is the seriousness of possible depreciation in sugar supply in war time represented by the relatively insignificant importations from the Philippines?

I desire now to talk about the alleged competition of the Philippines with beet sugar. It is all fiction. Not a single pound of Philippine sugar enters the beet-sugar territory. In the first place, there is not enough of that sugar entering this country; in the second place, the overland freight rates from the ports of entry to the territory are absolutely prohibitive.

Mr. Chairman, I do not blame the beet-sugar people, because they are in business to make money, but only last year they vigorously opposed the barge bill in Congress because it provided for a cheaper and better transportation system on the Mississippi and its tributaries tapping the beet-sugar territory. I repeat, I don't blame them for that, but when they tell this committee of the "Philippine menace" in the offing I am reminded of that ancient hyperbole in Homer's Iliad of the miserable mouse being born after the laboring of the mountains and the grand expectations.

Let me say a few words now on the potentiality of sugar production of the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. VILLAMIN. I am going to say something which has never been said before * * *. I was going respectfully to challenge Mr. TIMBERLAKE * * *.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. CROWTHER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman is extended three minutes.

Mr. VILLAMIN. Many thanks. They say if you permit the Philippines to expand her economic activities unrestrictedly American capital in sizeable amounts will flow thither and the time would soon come when they could produce an enormous amount of sugar. This is my reply: If you make the Philippine political status definite this American capital, which, by the way, I want to see in the hands of the Filipinos in the same way as Americans used British capital in the past, will go to the development of rubber and other undeveloped non-competing industries.

We are almost compelled under prevailing conditions and circumstances to go in the sugar business, for that is a well-established, centuries-old business where reasonable profits are made; and we are kept away by uncertainty from starting those noncompetitive industries which I mentioned in the early part of my statement here.

The Timberlake resolution will add enormously to the already uncertain political status of the Philippines. To him who would analyze that measure in this light it will become evident that while it will be a bomb to the Philippine sugar industry it will be a boomerang to the beet-sugar interests. Both sides will lose, and it is uneconomic.

Yesterday, out in the lobby, Mr. Lippitt, the vice president of the Great Western Sugar Co., said to me: "We are giving you people good advice. It is the idea of diversification." I told him we were not taking many advices from our adversaries. And there is no hard feeling in that, Mr. Lippitt.

Diversification, gentlemen, is the talismanic word that hopeless politicians and hopeful candidates hand out to the farmers when a farm question reaches an impasse. We have in the Philippines already a reasonably well-balanced agricultural diversification. Can you imagine that even Hawaii and Cuba are advising us to diversify? Those two countries need that advice for themselves infinitely more than the Philippines, and they know it perfectly well.

We are told, "Sell your sugar in the Orient." * * * Oriental countries are tariff inclosed. Their tariff walls are higher than in the United States. We are not able to compete with Java, which dominates the oriental markets now. The only way to compete with Java is to reduce our production costs vertically and horizontally to the Javanese level, and that spells the reduction of our standard of living to the plane of the coolie labor in Java, whose daily wage is 20 cents or less. That, gentlemen, means the complete undoing and annihilation of the 30 years of work by America in the Philippines of economic amelioration and social regeneration. Is this not worth thinking about?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Are there any questions?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman his official position.

Mr. VILLAMIN. I have no official position. I am a lawyer. I have engaged in the study of economics, finance, and international affairs during the last 10 years. I am untrammelled and unhampered by official representation, political consideration, or candidatorial commitment. I discuss this question objectively on its merits, and on them alone.

May I add, Mr. TREADWAY, that, modestly, in the teeth of opposition and misapprehension, I am leading the movement for deferred separation from America for purely Filipino reasons, the principal one being the commercial advantages that we derive from our association with this country. My conviction is when we shall have established a strong economic structure for our country our independence will have become maintainable and its advent will have been accelerated.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness will please answer the questions without expatiation.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like a little expatiation.

The CHAIRMAN. It is all at the expense of the time of the other witnesses.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it is very interesting. I would like to ask another question, if you do not mind, Mr. Chairman.

At the very beginning of your remarks, perhaps you explain more in detail just what you refer to as the uncertain status—I heard you use those words. I would like to know more about that.

Mr. VILLAMIN. It is simply this: The beet-sugar producers who are not constitutional lawyers have affirmed here that the Philippines are a foreign country. That's not so, gentlemen. By the unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States the Philippines, though not an integral part of this country, is, nevertheless, an insular possession and not foreign to it. The Filipinos are neither citizens of nor foreigners to the United States. They are a legal conundrum, a political exclamation mark, an international anomaly. But the overshadowing fact is the Philippines are under the American flag as fully and as completely as the Capitol or the White House.

Mr. Chairman, I see your gavel is about to descend. Just half a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. You asked for 5 minutes and you have been on the stand for 15 minutes. I am only suggesting this in fairness to the other witnesses.

Mr. VILLAMIN. We are fighting against tremendous odds.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in revising his remarks, as he will have a chance to do, he will state the sources of the data and statistics bearing on the brief references that he made in his remarks?

Mr. VILLAMIN. With pleasure, Congressman.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have him elaborate still further his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Let him elaborate them in his extension.

Mr. TREADWAY. I say in his extension in the record, in his written brief, I would like to have elaborated somewhat in reference to the relations between the United States and the Philippines and give a description of his reference to the "uncertain status." Further, his references to Philippine independence.

Mr. VILLAMIN. I have an article published in the Saturday Evening Post covering the point.

Gentlemen, I do not want to be cut off on the statement of my position on Philippine independence. I am opposed to immediate and complete independence now because of the economic advantages we enjoy which, as I said before, is the only thing that will speed the dawning of the day of our coveted independence.

If the limitation principle is adopted, that will knock off the bottom of my argument and render my position on the independence question untenable. Under that impact, if I am sincere and consistent, I should reverse myself and become an independence advocate. That I will do without hesitation and without reservation if America commits the colossal contradiction which the Timberlake resolution has in contemplation.

Mr. GARNER. I want to make a suggestion: If we are to retain the Philippines indefinitely, had they not better be brought under the Territorial laws and made a part of the United States as a Territory?

Mr. VILLAMIN. I am against the indefinite retention of the Philippines by the United States. I stand firmly on that as a principle.

The United States, I conceive, is under a binding moral obligation to prepare the Filipinos for nationhood and help them acquire, when the time of separation comes, a reasonable chance to exist in tolerable tranquillity, security, and prosperity. The Timberlake resolution will prevent the consummation of that great and glorious hope.

CLAIMS INCIDENT TO EXPLOSION AT THE NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, LAKE DENMARK, N. J.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12236, with Senate amendments, concur in the Senate amendments, and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12236, with Senate amendments, to concur in the Senate amendments, and pass the bill. The Clerk will report the bill with the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12236) to provide an appropriation for the payment of claims of persons who suffered property damage, death, or personal injury due to the explosion at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N. J., July 10, 1926.

The Senate amendments were read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do the amendments in any way cover insurance companies?

Mr. ACKERMAN. They have been deducted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

PENSIONS

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 14800, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 14800, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. SNELL. Is that a pension bill?

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14800) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers, sailors, and marines of said war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this agreeable to the minority members of the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is. I have just had a conference with the ranking member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD, Mr. ELLIOTT, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

MAJ. WILLIAM P. WILSON

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the omnibus bill H. R. 16522, which granted a pension to Marie T. Wilson, widow of Maj. William P. Wilson, late of the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, who died while in the line of duty November 27, 1927.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Major Wilson's work was most important and his contribution to the national defense was of the greatest moment, through his untiring efforts in the perfecting of an anti-aircraft fire-control instrument. One of the greatest problems in connection with our aircraft defense has been that of obtaining a high degree of accuracy for our anti-aircraft guns. Major Wilson's wonderful success in designing such an instrument is of international significance. As matters now stand, our Army is in a position to protect our citizen homes against an aircraft attack.

Major Wilson has, since the World War, unremittingly given himself to the task and has given every ounce of his nerve and energy to the perfection and completion of this great invention.

In this connection I want to read from Col. C. E. Kilbourne, Coast Artillery Corps; Maj. Gen. C. C. Williams, Chief of Ordnance; and Maj. O. L. Spiller, Coast Artillery Corps, their estimate of this man's great work for his Nation:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF COAST ARTILLERY,
Washington.

During the war, anti-aircraft gunfire, while it improved somewhat toward the close, was relatively ineffective. The fire had to be so conducted that the projectiles would burst, not where the plane was when observed, but where it would be after the piece was loaded and fired and the projectile reached the plane. This involved:

First. Determining the position in altitude and direction of the plane.

Second. Determining its course and speed.

Third. From these determining where the plane would be at the end of the loading and the time of flight of the projectile, which time of flight itself depended upon the future position of the plane.

Fourth. Determining the fuze setting that would cause the projectile to burst at the proper instant.

When the speed of a plane is considered (40 to 50 yards a second) you may grasp the complications of the problem and the importance of shortening all operations preceding the actual firing of the piece. For example, an error of 5 yards in determining the course of the plane during 1 second, would result in an error of 50 yards at the end of 10 seconds, leaving the plane still within the danger zone of the bursting shell. But if the time between the computations and the burst were 30 seconds the error would be 150 yards; if 1 minute elapsed, the error would become 300 yards; in either of these last the burst would be ineffective.

It was essential therefore that a system be developed by which the instruments would automatically predict the future position of the plane continuously, and that these predictions should be automatically converted into elevation and direction for the gun and into the correct fuze setting. Furthermore, it was essential that these data should be instantly indicated to those operating the gun and the fuze setter so that they, by merely keeping certain indices on the gun and fuze setter, opposite corresponding indices actuated by electric impulse from the controlling instruments, could maintain continuous and accurate fire.

It was to this problem Major Wilson addressed himself. He utilized, of course, all he could glean from similar efforts in foreign armies. But the instrument he designed, and which we have adopted for our service, is purely his own. Not only will his instrument operate for a plane moving on a straight course but will predict for a plane moving on a regular curve. It will not predict for an erratic course, but you

must remember that planes of high maneuverability are targets for the smaller automatic weapons. That bombing planes, for protection against which the anti-aircraft cannon are provided, are heavy and incapable of sudden changes of course—furthermore that, if prevented from flying toward their objective on a fairly straight course, their bombs can not be dropped upon that objective. For these bombing planes, therefore, Major Wilson's device solves our problem.

It was tested out at the Aberdeen proving ground last fall and so conclusively proved itself that our Ordnance Department was prepared, upon conclusion of the tests, to go ahead with the final design of the instrument. Some improvements were indicated as desirable and on these Major Wilson was putting the final touches when he died of heart failure.

Combined with his genius was an intense devotion to duty that won the respect, and a modesty and consideration for others that won the love of his comrades and fellow workers.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. KILBOURNE,
Colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Major Wilson served at Frankford Arsenal for nearly four years prior to his death. During the greater part of this time he was in charge of the optical and instrument laboratories and the fire-control design section. The period of Major Wilson's incumbency was one of great activity and rapid development. Great strides were being made in perfecting the new types of anti-aircraft and mobile artillery leading to the standardization of nearly all the improved types and calibers. A most important part of any artillery development is the provision of accurate means for directing and controlling the fire. Practically all of the new sighting systems, seacoast fire-control apparatus, and ballistic computing devices were designed under the direction and close personal supervision of Major Wilson.

The most noteworthy example of this officer's work, and the one that best illustrates his outstanding technical ability and inventive genius, is the anti-aircraft fire-control director TI. The work of designing this instrument was started in 1924 and carried forward continuously until his death. The instruments in use at the time this development was started were comparatively crude affairs, very similar to the ones improvised during the war. They were inherently inaccurate and unsatisfactory. All types were based on assumptions and approximations designed to simplify the computing problem, but necessarily introducing inaccuracies seriously affecting the value of the computed data.

Major Wilson, disregarding all precedent, attacked the problem from an entirely new angle and succeeded before his death in developing an instrument theoretically and by actual firing test superior to any similar purpose instrument in existence.

In order to appreciate the difficulties of this work it is essential that the problem be at least partially understood. The target is moving at a high rate of speed through space. Its position with respect to the battery is constantly changing in three dimensions. The gun must be pointed sufficiently in advance of the target in order that the projectile and the target will meet, and the fuze must be so timed as to burst the projectile at that instant. Variations in muzzle velocity, wind, atmospheric density, and drift must all be accurately computed, and the necessary corrections applied to the firing data. All of this must be done continuously and automatically.

The director, which is essentially a supercomputing machine, solves all the geometrical and ballistic problems involved. It automatically computes the future position of the target based on the angular rates of change in azimuth and elevation; it automatically multiplies these rates by the time of flight of the projectile. It automatically applies all the ballistic corrections; thus the instrument is able to give continuously the azimuth, quadrant elevation, and fuze range, corresponding to the future position of the target. These data are transmitted automatically to the guns. The guns are trained by traversing and elevating in such manner as to keep two moving pointers in coincidence. Sights and range drums are eliminated from the carriage. It is not necessary that the manning personnel of the guns see the target. A machine that will do all this is necessarily very intricate and complicated. A high degree of precision is necessary in its design and construction.

Other anti-aircraft projects worked out under Major Wilson's direction include a sighting system that is vastly superior to preceding types; a machine gun data computer and several types of machine-gun sights. His contributions to seacoast artillery fire control are numerous and include the development of the cloke plotting and relocating board, which is now standard for all long-range batteries; an improved range-correction board, a percentage corrector, and the new standard long-range depression position finder.

His work for the field artillery covers such items as new sights and sight mounts for the 105 mm. howitzer, the 75 mm. gun, the 75 mm. pack howitzer, the 75 mm. infantry mortar, and the 37 mm. infantry gun. The sighting system for the mount first mentioned incorporates certain new and valuable features which make it superior to any similar

foreign development. The other sights compare favorably with the new developments in other countries.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. WILLIAMS,
Major General, Chief of Ordnance.

The first knowledge I had of Major Wilson's interest in this type of development was in the summer of 1920 when I saw him at Aberdeen Proving Ground. He questioned me at great length concerning the types of fire-control instruments in use by the allied armies during the World War and the relative efficiency of each. I was able to give him considerable data along this line for the reason that I served in the antiaircraft service in France and had occasion to visit various allied antiaircraft units at the front as well as in training centers where officers were instructed in the theory of antiaircraft fire control.

The next year, 1921, when I was in Washington on official business, Major Wilson again talked with me on the subject and I found that he had acquired a most thorough knowledge of the theory of antiaircraft fire and of all the principles involved, and, also, that he knew the mechanical details of all of the instruments used in the allied armies, and understood thoroughly their weak points. At this time Major Wilson informed me that he had in mind a "central control instrument" which would overcome all the mechanical defects that were experienced in operating the war instruments and would be correct in principle. However, he had considerable doubt that he could make the machine work. I found out later through further acquaintance and conversation with Major Wilson that this last remark of his was prompted more by his modesty than by actual fear that the instrument would not be a success. After this I saw Major Wilson at intervals of about six months until he completed his instrument in 1926. I can not say exactly how much of his time he devoted to the study and design of this instrument, but I know that during this five years he was continually studying the antiaircraft problem, making and remaking parts of the apparatus many times in order to obtain the performance at which he was aiming.

Although he received ideas and suggestions from many people and made use of the ideas which were applied by others during the war, it may be safely said that Major Wilson's design was absolutely original and the principles he applied to determine the firing data were entirely different from those employed in any other instrument.

Some of the objectionable features of the war instruments were that they were inaccurate, slow, and based on too many assumptions as to the course, speed, and expected maneuver of the airplane. Neither were they provided with means in the instrument for correcting for the effect of wind, drift, and change in muzzle velocity. These last-named variations are very common and should be taken care of by any instrument before it can approach accuracy. In Major Wilson's instrument practically all of these were overcome. The instrument was accurate, was speedy in operation, and contained means for correcting for variations in wind, drift, and muzzle velocity. There would be no comparison whatever between the performance of a 4-gun battery firing at an airplane using the best of the war-time instruments and the same battery using the Wilson instrument. With the latter the fire would be considerably faster and so much more accurate that it would be apparent to the casual observer not familiar with the principles of antiaircraft fire.

Very respectfully,

O. L. SPILLER,
Major, Coast Artillery Corps.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL, 1929

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice to the House that to-morrow morning, after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of business on the Speaker's table, I shall ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the first deficiency bill, 1929.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. With twenty million and odd dollars put on by the Senate.

ELLIS ISLAND

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a censorship of the press brought about by a minor official of the United States Government, the Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island.

Now, there is a tendency in this country on the part of a few unimportant people to abolish the great American institution of freedom of speech and free press, and here and there a petty official in a minor office is found willing to carry out this pur-

pose. A few days ago there arrived at Ellis Island an English boy, a stowaway, on the steamer *Lancastina*. He arrived with both feet frozen. Under the law, of course, the boy can not be admitted. The deportation is mandatory. A daily newspaper in New York City sent one of its reporters to Ellis Island to interview this boy, and admission to newspaper men was refused by the Commissioner of Immigration.

That naturally causes to arise a suspicion as to the condition of the Government institution at Ellis Island.

Gentlemen, I worked there 21 years ago under Commissioner Watchorn, and the island was so conducted at that time that newspaper men were admitted at all times, and everything that was going on there was open to the inspection of the public. I now charge that there must be something very rotten at Ellis Island to prompt the Commissioner of Immigration passing a rule or censorship preventing representatives of the press from going on the island and seeing people.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In a moment.

Gentlemen well know that the press has access to Government institutions, hospitals, penal institutions, and departments; and it is not only improper but contrary to the very principle of our Government to establish a censorship of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman served there under a Democratic administration, while now we are under Republican rule.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no. Robert Watchorn was then the Commissioner of Immigration and Oscar Straus and Charles Nagle were the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor during my time, both Republicans.

Mr. BLANTON. But it was under a Democratic administration.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Twenty years ago Oscar Straus was Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and a more humane and able man never served in that capacity. I want to take this opportunity of advising and serving notice that I shall start an investigation of Ellis Island of my own, and if there is anything there that Mr. Day thinks he can hide by reason of his censorship, I will bring it to light. [Applause.]

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 278, a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 278

Resolved, That Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives be amended by inserting a new paragraph following paragraph 2, which shall be known as paragraph 2a, and shall read as follows:

"2a. Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

"(1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and

"(2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which has just been read from the Clerk's desk is one to amend an existing rule, Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. This proposed rule has been the subject of informal discussion among the Members of the House for a number of years. I have discussed on the floor of the House this proposed rule a number of times. The amendment to the rule as it is before you now has been carefully considered by the parliamentary clerk, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules, and a large number of the membership of this House. The Committee on Rules unanimously reported this resolution as proposing a proper amendment to the House rules.

The proposal in this new rule is simply this: Many bills which are introduced are to amend statutes. Such bills are reported back to the House, and there is nothing either in the bill or in the report accompanying the bill to advise Members of the House just what specific changes the bill proposes to make in the statute under consideration. If this amendment to Rule XIII is adopted, then hereafter a committee which reports a bill to amend an existing statute must show in the report just what changes are proposed. Suppose a bill is to amend a statute—we will just call it section 100—by omitting some words

and adding thereto other words. The proposal is that the report shall show by stricken-through type the words to be omitted and by italics the words that are added, so that a Member who is interested in knowing just what changes it is proposed to make in the statute under consideration can get the report, read it, and have before him exactly the changes which are proposed to be made. Personally, I have followed this practice as to all bills I have been authorized to report from the committees on which I served, and the reports which accompanied such bills showed exactly the changes which were to be made. Some members from other committees have also followed this practice, but I do not know that any one committee has followed this practice.

We want here by a general rule to enforce that practice on every committee that reports out a bill proposing to repeal or amend any statute or part thereof. It will greatly aid Members who desire to follow legislation in knowing exactly what changes are proposed, and it will enable them to acquaint themselves with the changes that are proposed by reading the committee report. Very often we have bills before us to amend section so-and-so to read as follows. It occurs occasionally the gentlemen who have charge of such a bill can only say in a general way what the effect of the proposed changes will be. They appear on the floor without even the code, the Statutes at Large, or anything else which will enable them to answer questions as to what specific changes are proposed. Under this rule such questions will be answered specifically in the report before the bill is called up for consideration on the floor of the House. I think it will greatly aid in orderly legislation. Many of the State legislatures now require proposed changes in statutes be shown either in the reports accompanying bills or in the bills themselves.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. The Public Lands Committee, for instance, last week reported a bill of some two pages in which but one word was to be changed, and the most of the bill was a long description of land to be added to a forest reserve. Now, would it be necessary to print the entire bill, or would it be sufficient to indicate the change to be made?

Mr. RAMSEYER. It would be sufficient to indicate only the change to be made, and the second paragraph of the resolution covers that:

A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment.

It would not be necessary to print the entire bill.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was not here when the gentleman began his statement. Is it contemplated that when a bill is reported amending a section of an existing statute that the entire section shall be repeated and then that the new matter shall be italicized? That is a very convenient method of legislation, and is required by the constitutions of a great many States.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is the practice in some of the States. I have bills in my pocket showing the practice followed in the State of New York, and a similar practice is followed in Vermont, Pennsylvania, and, I think, in Virginia. Since this matter has been up for discussion among Members of the House I have heard of at least 12 or 15 States in which the changes proposed to be made must be shown in the bill itself or in the accompanying report, as this rule requires.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. At the present time, very often a bill is reported here which provides, for instance, that a certain section of an existing statute shall be amended by adding certain words.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And you have to consult the statute that is in existence and perhaps many preceding statutes to ascertain the effect of the proposed amendment. This rule would not meet that case, would it?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; this rule meets your case. This rule would require that statute to be amended, be printed in the report together with the words to be added printed in italics, so you could see at a glance the proposed change.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Set out in the bill or in the report?

Mr. RAMSEYER. In the report.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But not in the bill?

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; this rule does not contemplate any change in the existing practice in regard to printing bills. The accompanying report must show the proposed changes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I hope some time the gentleman may consider going a step further and proposing that the bill

itself shall reenact the section that is involved, so anybody at a glance can see exactly what change is made in existing law.

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is merit to the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUDSON. That was the point I wanted to bring out. The bills are laid upon our desk, and we have then the first notice of proposed legislation. It seems to me, as is the practice in the State of Michigan, the bill ought to carry in brackets the part of the statute that is to be eliminated and in italics the proposed amendment; then we would have notice before referring to the report of the committee.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is the practice in many States, but there are so many bills introduced here and so few reported out it was thought at least for a starter we had better limit ourselves to showing the changes in the bills that are actually reported and show those changes in the reports accompanying the bills.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NEWTON. The purpose, of course, is to inform the membership of the House as to what the original act is and the proposed changes, so that each Member will know them. It seems to me this can be done as effectively by the method proposed here in the rule, to have this embodied in the report, as it would be to have it in the bill itself.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I think so.

Mr. NEWTON. I know that on most of the bills our committee has reported out amending the interstate commerce act; we have followed that practice in the report.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I know that the gentleman from Minnesota, who is now interrogating me, has followed that practice in the bills he has reported which proposed changes in existing statutes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa five additional minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, the gentleman's rule will be of great help to some of us who work on the Consent Calendar, but I think it is important that the gentleman should embody in his remarks a warning to the drafters of bills amending existing laws or statutes not to use line references in amending bills, such references as "the fifth" or the "seventh line" of the second paragraph or "after the semicolon in the tenth line." Such language has become quite customary. Especially is this true of the Navy Department and the War Department, where many of these bills are drafted. They may be working from a particular edition which they have before them and the lining changes in each edition or print of the law. References should be by sections and by quoting sufficiently from the law as to make the amendment clear. Therefore, for the sake of good and proper legislation the amendment should show the certain word in a certain section that is to be stricken out and show what is to be inserted in lieu thereof and the complete amended section. We have considerable trouble with a reference to a certain line, when we are all working with different editions of the law. The best form is to provide, for example: "That the section as amended shall read as follows."

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman's warning is well taken, and I adopt it now as my own, giving the gentleman, however, due credit of authorship.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. The resolution applies only to bills and joint resolutions. What does the gentleman think of having it broad enough to apply also to House resolutions from the gentleman's Committee on Rules that have to do with substantive changes in the rules? Would it not be wise to have this same regulation apply to the Rules Committee in such cases? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, I am trying to recall whether such a situation as that to which the gentleman now refers has ever arisen.

Mr. CRAMTON. The situation has arisen in a rather conspicuous recent instance, and I wondered whether the failure of the Committee on Rules, having reported this resolution to apply to all other committees of the House, to include language that would apply to themselves was based on their realization that they would themselves abide by the reform without any such requirement.

Mr. RAMSEYER. No. The Committee on Rules, of course, never gave the thought embodied in the gentleman's suggestion any consideration. The rules are simple propositions in comparison with our statute laws. The rules of the House are much more easily found and can be very readily compared; every Member on the floor of the House is entitled to have them before him. I am sure that the Members of the House feel there is no necessity for making this rule applicable to resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CRAMTON. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement that the Rules Committee does not feel that they ought to follow this practice that they are prescribing for all other committees?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The Rules Committee has not given it any thought. The Rules Committee, so far as I know, has in the past, and will in the future, I am sure, make very plain to the House membership any changes proposed to the rules of the House so as to make it perfectly clear to the gentleman from Michigan and others interested what it is proposed to be changed in any existing rule.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. What would be the effect if the committee failed to comply?

Mr. RAMSEYER. If the committee failed to comply with the rules of the House?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; with the rule with reference to the report of the bill?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The rule requires bills of a certain kind to be accompanied by a report showing certain things.

Mr. DENISON. Suppose the committee should bring in a report and not comply with the rule. Would a point of order lie?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That will be determined by the Speaker if that situation should arise. My own opinion is that a point of order would lie.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SNELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the rule reported by the gentleman from Iowa, although I think it is far from what the House needs. It deals only with bills and resolutions introduced in the House. But instead of being a House rule this ought, in my opinion, to be a bill which, when made a law, would be applicable to all bills and resolutions introduced in either the House or the Senate.

I did not know that the gentleman from Iowa had introduced the rule now before us, when on December 6 I introduced a bill to amend chapter 6, title 44, of the United States Code by inserting a new section to be known as section 189-a, which provides that any bill or resolution proposing an amendment to any existing statute or to the Constitution shall have matter to be stricken out printed with a line drawn through the same and new matter printed in italics; and provides also that the provisions of the proposed new section shall govern the printing of amendments to bills, resolutions, joint resolutions, and memorials so far as applicable.

These provisions of the bill I introduced are found in the statutes of Wisconsin, and in those of other States. The language is clear, definite, not to be misunderstood. It provides that proposed amendments to bills and to resolutions shall be printed in one way and in one way only. But I notice that the rule submitted by the gentleman from Iowa provides that the committee shall include in its report—

(2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

Now that, I think, is very far from being as specific and exact as it ought to be. Indeed, it is not specific, definite, at all. It would allow committees to report bills and amendments in either of three different and dissimilar ways—that is, by "stricken-through type and italics," or by "parallel columns," or by "other appropriate devices," leaving to the imagination what these "devices" may be.

There should be not a mere House rule on this important subject, but a law applicable to bills in either House or Senate commanding that the matter to be stricken out shall be printed with a line drawn through it, and that the new matter shall be printed in italics. That is all that is necessary, and it has long worked perfectly in actual practice in Wisconsin and other States.

I trust the gentleman from Iowa will consent to such an amendment to the proposed rule, because there could not then be the slightest objection to it except that it does not, can not, apply to Senate bills. But if the rule is to leave it discretionary with committees to report amendments in either of three different ways it will not meet the situation.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. In view of the fact that we have some bills like the Judicial Code, should not there be some leeway?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In reference to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan, I will say that in the original copy of my bill there was a clause expressly excepting from its provisions bills for a general revision of the laws (the Judicial Code), but it was inadvertently omitted from the copy introduced in the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That exception is in the statutes of Wisconsin, and I intended to present that identical amendment to the committee having my bill before it.

Mr. MICHENER. I might say that when the matter was before the Committee on Rules, I was of the same opinion. I insisted on this rule being made absolutely definite.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It ought to be.

Mr. MICHENER. With no leeway, so that all reports would be uniform, so that there could be no question; but after giving the matter mature thought, and applying the theory to the House practice, I feel that it is entirely advisable to pass this resolution allowing some discretion.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Right there, let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that the statutes of Wisconsin and of other States specifically provide that the law respecting the printing of amendments shall not be applicable to a bill for a general revision of the statutes. Such a revision comes only once in many years. It is always very voluminous and involved, and should be exempted from the provisions of the law governing the printing of amendments.

Mr. MICHENER. For instance, take the Sherman antitrust law. That is a very lengthy statute. Little bills are introduced now and then which affect certain sections of that law, probably two or more. Would the gentleman think it advisable in such a bill to print the entire Sherman antitrust law, which is a large pamphlet?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think that anything which would inform the House ought to be printed. A bill should be printed, the parts to be eliminated stricken through, and the amendments printed in italics, so that anybody reading the bill and the report will understand precisely what is intended. Otherwise, you compel an elaborate study and comparison such as it is impossible for the Members of the House to give to the thousands of measures pending before Congress.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, practically all of the suggestions that have been made on the floor of the House here to-day relative to these changes in the rules have been considered by the Committee on Rules, and they were considered very carefully. As a matter of fact, in the practical working out of these various matters there are a good many rules that will apply to State legislatures and work out satisfactorily, that will not apply in the National Congress on account of the difference in procedure and the wide application of measures considered. We do not know that this rule is perfect in every respect, and make no such claims, but we think it is a step in the right direction, and is a rule that is in keeping with the desire of a majority of the Members of the House; that is, that we try something along this line. It may be necessary a little later to change or amend this rule, but we think that it is as definite and distinct in its application as we feel like recommending to the House at the present time. I do not know but that some of the suggestions made here to-day will eventually be considered as desirable and be incorporated in the rule, but at the present time, from the careful consideration that we have given it, and it was discussed very carefully for some length of time in the committee, we feel this is as far as we ought to go in recommending to the House at the present time. Intentionally we did not desire to make the rule too drastic at first, and until we knew how it would work out in the everyday procedure of the House.

I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for the adoption of this rule and the mechanical working of the rule, if adopted, have been clearly stated by the gentleman from Iowa

[Mr. RAMSEYER], the author of the amendment to the rule. I think the rule will go a long way in meeting a situation that many Members of the House have recognized heretofore as being very necessary to correct in order to expedite better consideration of bills when amendments are proposed to existing statutes. It is true that the rule might go further in its provisions, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], but it will be noticed from a reading of the proposed change in the rules that quite a large latitude is allowed by way of discretion to the members of a committee as to the method they shall employ in pointing out the changes that are proposed in existing law.

It does not set down any hard and fast rule or iron-bound rule of mechanical printing, so to speak, but gentlemen will observe that it allows alternative methods to be used in the judgment of a committee to set out fairly by these three methods proposed what the existing text of the statute is and what the proposed change is in that statute. This objection was urged to the proposal requiring all bills when introduced to show the changes suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I think it is rather a sound objection. At each session of the Congress some 15,000 or 20,000 bills are introduced. Many of them involve proposed amendments to existing law. To print them in that way would necessarily very largely increase the cost of printing bills and the time used in preparation. It was thought by the Committee on Rules, as a matter of experiment, I might call it evolution, that at least for the present we should make the requirements relate only to bills actually considered by committees and reported out of the committees to be placed upon the calendars of the House. We thought that would give Members fair opportunity, without having the textbooks of existing law before them, to make an off-hand comparison to see in a practical-sense way what are the proposed changes in existing law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The rule, if adopted in its present form, gives any committee the option to report a suggested amendment in either of three or four different ways, and there will be nothing like uniformity in the reporting of measures by committees. There ought to be an absolute mandatory requirement that every committee in reporting a bill shall report an amendment with the parts to be eliminated stricken through and the proposed amendment in italics.

Then there could not be opportunity for mistake.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, I think that suggestion has been answered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the Committee on Rules candidly confesses to the House it does not recognize this as the last word, probably, on that proposition. But we think for the present at least the committee certainly went a long way to correct a situation which I think the gentleman realizes ought to have been corrected long ago.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will allow me to suggest right there, I have seen some very cunning things done in reporting bills, and sometimes 90 per cent of the House deceived as a result of such cunning—

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is for that very purpose we are bringing in this rule.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will permit, line 14 says that the committee may indicate the amendment through "other appropriate typographical devices." The expression "other appropriate typographical devices" is very ambiguous and may permit the cunning of a Member, if he wishes to exercise it, to so report an amendment as to deceive the ordinary reader.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am unwilling to admit that any committee of this House would deliberately bring in a bill deliberately conceived for the purpose of deceiving the House and engage in that species of cunning to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. VESTAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will.

Mr. VESTAL. I have thought—of course, I am for this rule; I think it is a step forward; but it seems to me that the rule ought to go a little further, so that the bills reported from a committee, all bills reported from a committee ought to carry the full language of the statute sought to be amended, and the statute as amended, in the bill reported as well as in the report, not in the bill as proposed to the House, but in the bill as re-

ported back to the House for action, and it seems to me that that bill ought to carry the same language the report carries.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say if that appeals to the gentleman from Iowa or the chairman of the committee, of course, they can yield for that purpose to offer an amendment, but I do not know they will do so. I would not be inclined to yield further on the subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, only one word. It was not the idea of the Committee on Rules to make this a limited mandatory rule in the beginning. We wanted to work it out so that we can go in the direction that so many Members of the House have expressed a desire at various times. We discussed that very carefully, left it open to a certain amount of discretion, and as soon as we see how this works, if it works in the right direction, we will make a rule perhaps more mandatory. But it was the opinion of the committee, this was as far as we ought to go at the present time.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman is one of the best parliamentarians and I want to ask him a question for the enlightenment of the rest of us here. This provides three methods. One by stricken-through type and italics, by parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices. I want to ask the gentleman from New York, who is to be the judge of the appropriateness of typographical devices?

Mr. SNELL. To begin with, I should leave some discretion to the committee that makes the report, and if it is necessary to make other limitations in order to obtain the cooperation of the committees we can do that at a later time. You must remember this is more or less an experiment.

Mr. DENISON. Suppose a committee brings in a report on a bill using a typographical device which they think is appropriate, and some other Member of the House does not think is appropriate. What can you do about it?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know as we could do anything, and I do not anticipate any serious complications to arise from this. I believe the committees will cooperate and that is all we can ask at present. I have discovered that when amending the rules of the House you have to be very careful and do it by degrees. We want to be sure of our ground so far as we can be at the time, and it will not be a very serious proposition to again amend or cut out this rule, if we find we have made an error in what we have done.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Will this rule apply to appropriation bills?

Mr. SNELL. It will apply to all bills carrying any legislation. Appropriation bills are not supposed to carry any legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. If so, it will probably put the Committee on Appropriations out of legislative business, would it not?

Mr. SNELL. To a certain extent it may limit it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I expected at this time to call up another privileged report from the Committee on Rules, relative to the reference of constitutional amendments. As the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], was unable to be here to-day, I shall not call it up at this time.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. It is to make an inquiry of my friend the chairman of the Committee on Rules with reference to the resolution just passed. I am in favor of it, but I was not in the House at the time the debate took place. I want to ask the gentleman one practical question with reference to it. If a committee should make a report without complying with it, what would be the effect? Would a point of order lie against the report of that committee?

Mr. SNELL. Well, it rather seems to me it would be up to the Speaker to determine that question. There are many rules that are always complied with in each particular.

Mr. CRISP. My inquiry was to bring out what was the intention of the Committee on Rules in that respect, thinking

it would have some bearing on the decision of the Speaker in interpreting the rule in that regard.

Mr. SNELL. I think it would be up to the Speaker to decide that point of order, but at first I would expect he would be fairly liberal in his rulings along this line. It is pretty hard to draw a hard-and-fast rule on this important subject; but we thought we would try this out, and if it does not work in its present form, we will either amend it to meet the conditions that arise or abandon it altogether.

Mr. CRISP. I am in sympathy with the rule.

REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 350.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 350) to provide for the reappointment of Frederic A. Delano and Irwin B. Laughlin as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

Resolved, etc., That the vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, caused by the expiration of the terms of Frederic A. Delano, of the city of Washington, and Irwin B. Laughlin, of Pennsylvania, on January 21, 1929, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbents for the statutory term of six years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this resolution been considered by the committee of the House?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; by the Committee on the Library.

Mr. SCHAFER. Has the committee unanimously recommended its passage?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ORDER DURING INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House Joint Resolution 386, now on the Union Calendar, relating to the protection of life and property and public safety during the inaugural ceremonies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 386) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, is hereby authorized to be appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to maintain public order and protect life and property in said District from the 28th of February to the 10th of March, 1929, both inclusive, including the employment of personal services, payment of allowances, traveling expenses, hire of means of transportation, cost of removing and relocating street-car loading platforms, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the commissioners. Said commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property, and to make special regulations respecting the standing, movement, and operating of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant under such conditions as they may impose special licenses to peddlers and vendors to sell goods, wares, and merchandise on the

streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, and to charge for such privilege such fees as they may deem proper.

Such regulations and licenses shall be in force one week prior to said inauguration, during said inauguration, and one week subsequent thereto, and shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, and in such other manner as the commissioners may deem best to acquaint the public with the same; and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any of such regulations shall be enforced until five days after such publication. Any person violating any of such regulations shall be liable for each such offense to a fine not to exceed \$100 in the police court of said District, and in default of payment thereof to imprisonment in the workhouse of said District for not longer than 60 days. And the sum of \$2,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby likewise authorized, to be expended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, during the period aforesaid, including the employment of personal services.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some information about the resolution. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The resolution provides that:

Any person violating any of such regulations shall be liable for each such offense to a fine not to exceed \$100 in the police court of said District, and in default of payment thereof to imprisonment in the workhouse of said District for not longer than 60 days.

Does the gentleman have in mind springing a sudden regulation upon the public so that a person may have absolutely no notice or knowledge of such regulation? The gentleman knows that ignorance of the law is no defense, because a person is presumed to know the law. Is not the gentleman going a little too far?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will state to the gentleman that under existing laws, 30 days' notice is required before a police regulation can be put into effect. This resolution removes that limitation so far as regulations governing the inauguration are concerned, but your committee is advised by the commissioners that they intend to publish the regulations relating to the inaugural ceremonies for the information of the public, but the limitation as to 30 days is removed by this resolution. This is a general resolution and it is in the form that has previously been adopted.

Mr. DYER. Is this similar to the resolution which was adopted four years ago?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will state to the gentleman that there was no extra appropriation made in 1924, but this is similar to the resolution adopted in 1920.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman know what regulations were made at that time?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. They had to do, as I recall, with the closing of certain streets and the roping off of certain streets. I can not remember all the regulations, but there were no drastic changes made in existing police regulations, as I recall.

Mr. SNELL. These are nothing more than general regulations to take care of a big crowd.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. That is all the resolution provides for.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, it sounds more mysterious, I suppose, than it really is or is intended to be, and I suppose it is all right if they have no drastic regulations in mind, so that people who come to Washington to attend the inauguration might find themselves placed in the calaboose for the violation of something they did not know anything about.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York need not worry about that, because these will be just general regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 297, a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York calls up House Resolution 297, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 297

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1731, to provide for the further development of vocational education

in the several States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the bill, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of Senate 1731, which has for its purpose the further development of vocational education in the rural communities of the several States of the Union. As the Members of the House well know, the Smith-Hughes Act, which was passed in 1917, I believe, authorized a continuing appropriation of \$3,600,000 to be distributed among the various States for the purpose of vocational training in various schools. This fund was to be matched by funds contributed by the several individual States. This bill simply authorizes more money to be used for this same purpose and under the same conditions. At the present time about 29 per cent of the schools are taking advantage of this fund, and there seems to be a demand much larger than we are able to meet on account of the size of the appropriation. There seems to be a general demand, especially in the country districts, that they be allowed to take advantage of these appropriations, and have this vocational education in their schools, while the bill that is before the House at the present time provides for an appropriation of \$500,000 and \$500,000 each year for 11 years, and then a continuing appropriation for all time of \$6,000,000 annually. The chairman of the Committee on Education will offer a committee amendment which will materially reduce that amount and also take out the continuing feature of the appropriation that is carried in the Senate bill. I will say to the Members of the House that this committee amendment is entirely satisfactory to the representatives of the vocational-training proposition.

A committee of that organization, from their convention in Philadelphia last month, came to Washington, and I want to say they are a fine, representative lot of men. I have never met a committee of men who appealed to me as more interested in their work, had a greater desire to cooperate in every way with Congress, and only ask for the things they ought to ask for, than was this committee; and I was very much impressed with the personnel of the committee and the work they are doing. The country districts are especially interested in this vocational educational training, and let me say to the Members of the House that this, in my judgment, is a real farm-relief measure, if anything could be considered as such, because it helps to educate the young boys and girls in the country districts in the questions that arise in the management and conduct of the farm industry. For that reason I believe it is very important and should be considered. As far as I know there is no opposition to this measure. It comes as a unanimous report from the Committee on Education and also from the Rules Committee. Unless there is some specific question, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 1731, to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories. Pending that motion, I would like to ask if there is any opposition to the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER. I will say to the gentleman from New York that there might be some opposition to the amendment that is to be offered.

Mr. REED of New York. I wanted to know if there was any opposition to the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. How much time does the rule provide?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hours; one hour on the side.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has an amendment he desires to offer. Perhaps he would like to control a little time in his own right.

Mr. TARVER. No, Mr. Speaker; I have had a conference with the chairman of the committee and he has agreed to give me such time as I may desire.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one hour of the time of general debate may be controlled by the chairman of the committee and one hour by the ranking Member on the Democratic side [Mr. LOWREY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pending the motion, the gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time be controlled one-half by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1731, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the sum of \$500,000, and for each year thereafter, for 11 years, a sum exceeding by \$500,000, the sum appropriated for each preceding year, and annually thereafter there is permanently authorized to be appropriated for each year the sum of \$6,000,000. One-half of such sums shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their farm population bears to the total farm population of the United States, exclusive of the insular possessions, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects in such States and Territories. The remaining half of such sums shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their rural population bears to the total rural population of the United States, exclusive of the insular possessions, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors, development and improvement of home economics subjects in such States and Territories.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Board for Vocational Education out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 annually to be expended for the same purposes and in the same manner as provided in section 7 of the act approved February 23, 1917, as amended October 6, 1917.

SEC. 3. The appropriations made by this act shall be in addition to, and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as, the appropriations made by the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and in the trades and industries; to provide cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditures," approved February 23, 1917, except that the appropriation made by this act for home economics shall be subject to the conditions and limitations applicable to the appropriation for agricultural purposes under such act of February 23, 1917, with the exception of that part of section 10 thereof which requires directed or supervised practice for at least six months per year, and that the appropriations available to the Federal Board of Vocational Education for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations, which, in the opinion of the board, are necessary for the efficient discharge of its responsibilities.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five minutes.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think every Member in the House of Representatives is fairly familiar with the work that has been done during the last few years, or since 1917, under the Smith-Hughes Act.

This bill does not change the work at all. This bill simply proposes to carry the work that is now being done throughout the country along the lines of agricultural vocational training and home economics into those communities that want the service and can not obtain it on account of lack of Federal funds.

I want to state at the outset that I shall offer some amendments. This bill was introduced in the first instance by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MENGES]. Mr. MENGES deserves the credit for any merit there may be in this bill, but in order to have it properly drafted and to meet certain situations it was reported out as a committee bill under my name.

We tried to get a rule at the last session. There were quite a number of the men in the House who thought then and who think now that the original bill carried too large an appropriation; that is, carried an appropriation over too many years.

The Senate bill provides that there shall be an appropriation of \$500,000 the first year, which shall be increased by \$500,000 the next year and each year thereafter for 11 years, until the appropriation reaches \$6,000,000 a year, and then it is to be a permanent appropriation of \$6,000,000 a year. In order to have consideration of the bill at this time, and to meet a very serious situation so ably outlined by the chairman of the Rules Committee, the leaders in vocational work in the various States

were called in to obtain their views. The matter was discussed with them, and an agreement was made to provide that the appropriation should continue for five years, that the first appropriation should be available for the year 1930 instead of 1929.

The reason we have adopted the Senate bill is because, inadvertently, in reporting out the House bill, the word "Territories" was omitted. This is included in the Senate bill.

The only changes in the bill which will be brought about by the amendments which I plan to offer are, first, to change the fiscal year in which the appropriation of \$500,000 will become available to 1930 instead of 1929; second, to carry the appropriation for a period of five years instead of 11 years. At the end of five years it will be necessary, if more money is needed to carry on the work, to come back for a new authorization.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman give us just a brief description of how these funds are obtainable by the various schools and just what instruction is imparted in the expenditure of the funds?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes. When a local school desires to set up a school in a certain community different rules prevail in different States. Some of the high schools will have 10 boys who will want to take vocational work, or 15 or 25 boys. They may establish a rule in a certain State or locality, for instance, that if 10 boys or girls in the school desire vocational education, then the next thing is to start the department with a trained teacher. They make application to their State board of education for one of the trained teachers in vocational agriculture. The teacher goes there and takes hold of that class. The work involves six months' practical work on the farm; that is, the boy has to work with his father, supervised to a certain extent by the vocational teacher.

In answering the question I want to read just a little excerpt from a statement which was made to us by Doctor Lane at the hearings. I am very glad the gentleman from New York has asked the question, because it is a very practical one. Here is what Doctor Lane says:

Every boy who elects to take the vocational work as part of his high-school education is required to carry on for at least six months at home some definite, practical work under the supervision of his teacher. Now, that means an economic return on the part of the boys in the production of livestock or crops or some other work around a farm.

The total labor income from this practical work during the past five years was \$23,637,924.25. This is not an estimate. It is based upon accurate cost accounting. For every dollar of Federal funds spent for vocational agriculture there was a financial return of \$2.25 realized by the boys from their labor. The total Federal fund spent for salaries of teachers of vocational agriculture during the 5-year period was \$10,418,460, and there was realized \$23,637,924.25 from the practical work the boys did.

This is the character of the work.

The curriculum adopted in the various States and in the different localities is to meet the local situation. For instance, over in my district they have an agricultural school. The curriculum of the school is based upon the farm business in that locality, training them along that line. They are working with their fathers in harmony with the prevailing farm activities in that community.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then this fund provides additional teachers or is the money paid over to the school board?

Mr. REED of New York. No; every cent of this money is used for teachers.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For teachers?

Mr. REED of New York. To provide the teachers for these schools throughout the country.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Who selects the teachers?

Mr. REED of New York. The State board of education or the local community, exactly the same as they would select any other teacher.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I will.

Mr. SCHAFER. Does Federal money pay the entire salaries of the teachers?

Mr. REED of New York. No; it varies in the different States. It is controlled by the States. In some States the community will pay one-third, the county may pay one-third, the town may pay one-third, or the city one-third, as the case may be. The State pays 50 per cent, and so on. That is all worked out by the State in cooperation with the Federal board.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. How many pupils do they have for one teacher?

Mr. REED of New York. That is left to the State board of education—in some cases we have 10, some 25, and so on.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. They might multiply the teachers indefinitely—get up a little group and get a teacher.

Mr. REED of New York. All the Federal Government has to do is to pay the sum over to the particular State and the State matches it, and then does as it pleases.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I will.

Mr. MILLER. Do these teachers come from the graduates of the various agricultural colleges?

Mr. REED of New York. In many cases they do.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. What about the use of this money as to its being divided between the larger cities and schools rather than the rural schools?

Mr. REED of New York. This will all be used for the rural schools.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I wonder if there is any thought of liberalizing the rules of the educational board so that it will make it possible for the smaller schools to have this benefit? I happen to know that under the present rule it eliminates most of the smaller schools in the participation of this money. So the larger amount goes to the city schools.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is speaking about the vocational schools in trades and industry.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. The gentleman thinks that there will be some loosening up of the rules?

Mr. REED of New York. No question about it. Now I want to give you a practical illustration. Here is the statement made by the State of Georgia. Of course what applies there will apply to most of the other States. Gentlemen know that a great many farms are being abandoned throughout the country.

The census of 1925 showed 61,000 fewer farms in operation in Georgia than when the 1920 census was taken. The Census Bureau took notice of the fact that in certain counties in the State of Georgia there was no marked decrease in the number of abandoned farms and wrote to the agricultural college in Georgia to ascertain the reason. The reply was that the only way they knew to account for it was that these counties were more adequately served with teachers of vocational agriculture.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think the bill recognizes the necessity of keeping the boy on the farm. The boy will not stay on the farm unless he has some hope of financial success. You teach the boy the way to raise livestock so that he can turn out a beef in 9 or 10 months and get the highest price for it that is possible, how to feed the animal, how to raise all kinds of crops that can be raised in his section, and if he can be assured of financial success he is going to stay on the farm—if this bill can teach the boys and the girls of the farm that there is something else besides worry and work, dirt and deficit, and give them hope of having the kind of a home they envision through their vocational work, you are going to keep them on the farm.

Agriculture forms the very foundation of our country. The onward march of this wonderful country depends, my friends, upon the advancement, the success, the contentment of the farmers of America. This bill has this purpose in view. It furthers the benefits of the Smith-Hughes Act, which has from its passage performed a real help to agriculture through vocational training of the boys and girls of the farm. [Applause.]

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BRIGHAM. What provision is made for industrial training?

Mr. REED of New York. That work is going on now with a continuing appropriation.

Mr. BRIGHAM. What is the appropriation?

Mr. REED of New York. Three million dollars for trades and industry and \$3,000,000 for agriculture.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do all of the States avail themselves of this appropriation and use the full amount allocated?

Mr. REED of New York. Practically all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. I yield myself three minutes more. Now, let me cover something here. You are all interested in the bill as well as your people back home, because this work has been going on in every community.

Now, this statement comes from a man whom you know:

It seems that after the agricultural vocational work had been in operation about five years a study was made to ascertain what became of the boys who had taken the vocational work. This survey of 8,000 boys that had taken one or more years of vocational agricultural instruction disclosed that 59 per cent of them were actually farming, 6 per cent were engaged in related occupations, 9 per cent in agricultural colleges, 15 per cent went to other colleges, and 11 per cent were in nonagricultural occupations.

Another survey has just been made covering the 5-year period ending in 1927. This 5-year record also shows 59 per cent actually engaged in farming, 9 per cent in related occupations, and only 2 per cent going to agricultural colleges.

A survey was made two years ago of the school system in New York State which included the persons who had attended the agricultural vocational course. This survey showed that 72 per cent of the boys who had been enrolled in courses of agriculture were either farming or attended a college of agriculture.

To show the growth of this work, when this law was passed there was a student body in vocational education of 25,000. The enrollment now is 1,000,000, showing an increase of 4,000 per cent in 11 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am a member of the gentleman's committee and favor this measure. I should like the gentleman to tell us, if he has not already done so, the organization that covers the country generally that made a study of this problem and that is urging the legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. The American Vocational Association, of course, has indorsed it in convention in every part of the land.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And the Department of Agriculture has strongly indorsed this bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; and the head of the Department of Commerce, the head of the Department of Labor, and the Secretary of Agriculture. It has been indorsed by many farm organizations throughout the United States.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And by those in charge of the public schools of the country?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes. It has a practically unanimous indorsement all along the line. I did not want to clutter up the Record with telegrams from industries and people in many lines of business activities.

Mr. PEERY. And no opposition has developed on the part of any of the States to this legislation?

Mr. REED of New York. Not at all.

Mr. PEERY. The department of instruction in Virginia is very much in favor of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Taking all the gentleman has said for granted, can he advance any good reason why the States which seem to be so much interested in this legislation can not carry it on themselves, without coming to the Federal Government for aid?

Mr. REED of New York. The best answer to that is that the States are now putting up \$2.65 for every dollar that they get from the Federal Government, and they apparently like this way of handling the matter.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am opposed to the principle of Federal aid. I feel that if the States can carry on an activity, then the States should carry it on and not come to the Federal Government for assistance.

Mr. LEAVITT. And is it not necessary in a movement of this kind of national value, where we desire it to be national in extent, that it have some national impetus behind it to start it and carry it on?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; and that is what did start it, and that is what is carrying it along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. At the suggestion of several gentlemen on the floor I ask unanimous consent to incorporate as a part of my remarks a list of the States and the number of schools receiving Federal aid for vocational education.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Schools receiving Federal aid for agriculture, 1927-28

	White	Colored
Alabama.....	87	20
Arizona.....	18	
Arkansas.....	59	28
California.....	93	
Colorado.....	51	
Connecticut.....	14	
Delaware.....	10	
Florida.....	43	7
Georgia.....	100	40
Idaho.....	22	
Illinois.....	182	
Indiana.....	137	
Iowa.....	109	
Kansas.....	97	2
Kentucky.....	97	6
Louisiana.....	43	46
Maine.....	20	
Maryland.....	34	1
Massachusetts.....	17	
Michigan.....	135	
Minnesota.....	50	
Mississippi.....	121	42
Missouri.....	120	1
Montana.....	25	
Nebraska.....	56	
Nevada.....	6	
New Hampshire.....	13	
New Jersey.....	30	1
New Mexico.....	19	
New York.....	97	
North Carolina.....	110	25
North Dakota.....	39	
Ohio.....	196	
Oklahoma.....	41	14
Oregon.....	30	
Pennsylvania.....	87	1
Rhode Island.....	5	
South Carolina.....	135	55
South Dakota.....	29	
Tennessee.....	116	22
Texas.....	167	65
Utah.....	26	
Vermont.....	5	
Virginia.....	106	21
Washington.....	42	
West Virginia.....	47	2
Wisconsin.....	79	
Wyoming.....	27	
Total.....	3,192	399

Expenditure of Federal, State, and local money for vocational agricultural education, by years, 1918 to 1927

Year	Amount of expenditure				
	Total	From Federal money	From State and local money		
			Total	State	Local
1927.....	\$7,469,295.39	\$2,801,591.57	\$4,667,703.82	\$1,509,065.78	\$3,158,638.04
1926.....	7,164,460.46	2,656,886.13	4,507,574.33	1,571,426.97	2,936,147.36
1925.....	6,146,124.01	2,262,542.88	3,883,581.13	1,370,964.90	2,512,616.23
1924.....	5,233,912.86	1,897,807.50	3,336,105.36	1,203,486.62	2,132,618.74
1923.....	4,647,042.04	1,669,698.75	2,977,343.29	1,108,461.22	1,868,882.07
1922.....	4,058,440.36	1,435,475.22	2,622,965.14	1,030,487.89	1,592,477.25
1921.....	3,393,088.21	1,192,131.17	2,200,957.04	968,074.16	1,232,882.88
1920.....	2,437,286.06	889,886.29	1,547,399.77	678,824.43	868,575.34
1919.....	1,413,938.49	528,679.13	885,259.36	399,082.80	486,176.56
1918.....	739,933.27	273,282.08	466,651.19	229,713.98	246,937.21

Percentage of Federal money expended for salaries of teachers of vocational agriculture in colored schools

	Rural population (1923 census)			Federal money expended for salaries of teachers in vocational agricultural schools during the fiscal year 1927		
	Total	Negro	Percentage of negro	Total	Negro	Percentage expended in negro schools
Alabama.....	1,838,857	703,819	38.3	\$96,448.29	\$11,327.64	11.7
Arkansas.....	1,461,707	398,628	27.3	81,827.62	15,115.00	18.5
Delaware.....	102,236	17,343	17.0	7,589.57		
Florida.....	612,645	208,891	34.1	31,981.25	(1)	(1)
Georgia.....	2,167,973	933,329	43.1	120,785.44	24,421.74	20.2
Kentucky.....	1,783,087	130,545	7.3	91,769.43	4,040.00	4.4
Louisiana.....	1,170,346	509,844	43.6	54,358.48	14,483.00	26.6
Maryland.....	580,239	119,970	20.7	26,756.23	241.67	.9
Mississippi.....	1,550,497	836,568	54.0	85,089.81	12,715.83	15.0
Missouri.....	1,817,152	44,074	2.4	106,049.56	750.00	.7
Oklahoma.....	1,488,803	101,504	6.8	69,974.43	7,071.45	10.1
North Carolina.....	2,068,753	608,242	29.4	120,127.50	15,190.00	12.6
South Carolina.....	1,389,737	748,230	53.8	78,124.73	9,173.73	11.7
Tennessee.....	1,726,659	281,294	16.3	97,520.92	9,992.85	10.2
Texas.....	3,150,539	518,321	16.5	170,515.08	20,864.00	12.2
Virginia.....	1,635,203	480,883	29.4	93,558.38	10,512.57	11.2
West Virginia.....	1,094,694	63,861	5.8	41,435.07	1,624.99	3.9

Data not available.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON].

Mr. YON. Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I did not know that we would have this bill under consideration this morning. It is of very striking interest to me at this time. As my mail came in this morning I found a letter from a widow in my district who is trying to raise her boy and to get him into this demonstration work in agriculture. She is making a plea in respect to the necessity for raising money to finish his high schooling. It is very gratifying to come into the House at a time like this and observe the House considering a measure that will give to the youth of the rural sections of the country a greater opportunity to develop the natural resources of the rural sections and also build up a better citizenship, more intelligent, more enlightened, and which will provide a better opportunity than the farmers of our day and of days gone by ever enjoyed.

Of course we are all in favor of the bill. I had no idea of saying a word when I came into the Chamber, but my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] said that it seemed nobody wanted to talk on a subject like this, and it seemed such a good subject that I felt I should say a few words in its favor. There is nothing that I enjoy more in my legislative work and in working among the people back home than to work with the boys and girls of the 4-H Clubs. They are doing a great work and a good service, and I heartily indorse the appropriation of any amount of money that can be added to that already made available for this great purpose.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the success of the Smith-Hughes Act has far exceeded the expectation of the Members of Congress at the time of its enactment in 1917. This success has been marvelous in one sense of the word. As was said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] this is farm-relief legislation in one sense of the word. I agree with him. The preparation and the effort given by means of this legislation to the young men and young women of the farms of the country are wonderful in their effect and influence on their future life. It prepares them for better methods of farming, causes them to take a renewed interest in agriculture, and causes them to remain upon the farms instead of going to the cities. It has created a sentiment in favor of real agricultural education. The sentiment created by means of this law is something like the sentiment in favor of better roads as a result of national aid to roads. National aid to roads and the coming of automobiles, trucks, and other motor vehicles have done more to create a better sentiment for good highways in the country than any other two things. I believe that the workings of this legislation are doing more to increase the sentiment in favor of real agricultural education than any other piece of legislation that has ever been enacted by Congress. The working of the law during the past 10 years shows there is a very great need and a real necessity for an increased appropriation in order to accomplish what was intended by the original act. That is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALMON. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman just stated the main purpose of the legislation is to increase the appropriation. Now, in the Smith-Hughes Act continuing appropriations were authorized, but, as I understand, no time limit on that authority is expressed in that act.

Mr. ALMON. That is true. There is no opposition to the bill. It comes with a favorable report from the Committee on Education, and I simply wanted to take this opportunity to say that I supported and voted for the Smith-Hughes law in 1917 and am heartily in favor of this bill and will vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MENGES].

Mr. MENGES. Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, my motive in introducing this bill in the House was brought about because of the agricultural conditions which are discussed before the Committee on Agriculture every day. This is national legislation which I feel is required. I believe in a trained agriculture because of the absolute necessity for the farmer to be acquainted with changing conditions which are continually confronting him. Take for example the corn borer. We passed a bill here in the House not very long ago appropriating \$10,000,000 for the purpose of eradicating the corn borer. Well, we can appropriate \$100,000,000 and we will never eradicate the corn borer. The corn borer is here to stay. I

say he is here to stay, and the man who will have to cope with the corn borer is the farmer. The Agricultural Department can give the farmer some instructions as to how to curb that curse, but so far as eradication is concerned that is out of the question. Now, I use this as an illustration as one insect that is going to invade the corn belt of the United States and remain there. Now what can be done? The thing to do is to establish agricultural operations of such a character that the corn borer can not thrive. That is the thing to do, and in order to do it we must be acquainted with the life history of the corn borer. In what stage of its development and when does it do the most damage? The department knows that the corn borer does the greatest amount of damage in the larval stage. The moth lays the egg on the cornstalk. A small larva hatches from the egg and proceeds to devour the cornstalk. It has spent the time of incubation on the cornstalk. In order to kill the larvae and destroy the eggs we must plow under or burn up or cut into feed, such as silage, the cornstalk.

Now we must arrange our agricultural operations in such a way that we can take advantage of these processes to get rid of the corn borer. That is what will happen in the Corn Belt of the United States and the farmer, to inaugurate these agricultural operations, must be trained. Take another insect. Over here in Pennsylvania where I come from we have an insect that is known as the angoumois moth. Its eggs are laid in the head of the wheat just as it is emerging from the stalk. The larva hatches from the egg and gets into the wheat grain and develops there, and if the grain is stored without putting a poison into it to kill the larva, by the time you have held the grain in the bin say, three, four, or six weeks, it will be absolutely worthless except for feed because the larva will hollow out the whole grain. Now we must curb the activities of that insect, the angoumois moth. What can we do? As soon as the wheat is dry enough after harvesting we thresh it and store it in bins and fumigate it with bisulphide of carbon and kill the moths.

Now there is another factor to be considered, and that is the economic side. I believe in a trained agriculture, and I am in favor of agricultural relief. I voted for it every time I got a chance. I think I am one of a few from the Eastern States who does that and who is not afraid to say so.

Mr. HUGHES. From what county in Pennsylvania are you from?

Mr. MENGES. York County.

Mr. HUGHES. Is that a farming county?

Mr. MENGES. It is one of the best and richest farming counties in the United States, and some of the best farmers that ever lived live there.

Mr. HUGHES. And you are speaking from experience?

Mr. MENGES. Yes. I am a dirt farmer, and I know exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. LOWREY. Are your farmers in that splendid Pennsylvania county making any money now in farming, or are they falling short financially?

Mr. MENGES. They are falling short. I am one of them.

Mr. LOWREY. I wish you would bring that out.

Mr. MENGES. I will be glad to.

Mr. ALMON. Will you tell us something of the workings of the vocational schools in your part of the country under the Smith-Lever law?

Mr. MENGES. The work that is done in my section is among the best that we have. We have now in my section young fellows who started out farming and who had exhibits at the annual show at Harrisburg, and have taken the championship prize for corn production, quality and quantity, of the Eastern States.

Mr. ALMON. Men who have attended these vocational schools?

Mr. MENGES. Yes; men who have taken advantage of this training, although we did not have vocational schools when they went to school. But they have taken advantage of the training offered by our agricultural school at the State college.

Mr. HASTINGS. I understand the various amounts allocated to the various States are paid over to the States, and the State authorities themselves distribute them?

Mr. MENGES. Yes. That is right. That is my idea.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is entirely under State distribution?

Mr. MENGES. Yes. That was the idea that I had in mind when I introduced the bill. I want the National Government to help to pay for the education and training of farmers who have to deal with national questions.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then this bill does not change the method of distribution used heretofore?

Mr. MENGES. Not as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as a member of the Committee on Education which had before it for consideration this bill, introduced in the other body by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, and having heard the evidence submitted to that committee, which justified the legislation in the form in which it was reported from the committee, I am very earnestly in favor of the bill in that form and am not able to understand the advisability of the adoption of the amendments, the effect of which would be to reduce the appropriation authorized to a mere fraction of what it was in the form in which the bill passed the Senate and in which it was reported from the committee.

However, it is not that question that I desire to discuss before the Committee of the Whole. I am going to vote for the bill either with or without the amendments. I am going on the theory that half a loaf is better than no bread, although in this instance it is not even half a loaf.

But I want to direct your attention during the brief time I have allotted to me to an amendment which I intend to offer to this bill. I believe I have a proposition here which merits your consideration, and I ask for your attention while I undertake to explain it to you.

This bill provides as follows:

The appropriation made by this act shall be in addition to and shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as the appropriation made by the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education"—

And so forth. That is the Smith-Hughes Act. The Smith-Hughes Act made this provision:

That for every dollar of Federal money so expended the State or local community or board shall spend an equal amount for the maintenance of such training.

In other words, the method of distribution provided under the original Smith-Hughes law and under this bill is that the Federal appropriation shall be matched either by appropriations from the State or from the local community.

Now, my amendment is directed to the matching proposition. I am not opposed, of course, to the matching provision. I realize that is the basic principle of all legislation of this character, but I am opposed to the proposition that the matching may be done by local communities, and I will undertake to explain to you why that is true.

According to the twelfth annual report of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, which I hold in my hand, 35 of the 48 States of the Union failed to appropriate enough money during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, to match the Federal appropriation. We will take, for instance, the State of Georgia, my own State. The Federal appropriation was \$194,569.14, the State appropriation was only \$118,904.53, while local communities furnished \$110,071.87.

Now what does that mean? It means that the Georgia State Board for Vocational Education, when the State failed to appropriate enough money to match the Federal fund, was reduced to the necessity of going to the communities of the State which were able to match the Federal fund and procuring from them funds with which the matching might be done. Thus the funds went to the more prosperous communities. In other words, they exemplified too literal an interpretation of the scriptural quotation:

To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away, even that which he hath.

Those districts of the State which were not financially able to contribute, where property values were low, where they were not able by local taxation to raise enough money for their educational purposes, and where therefore the need was the greatest—those districts were not able to obtain Federal aid for vocational education, but those districts of the State which were able financially to meet the Federal fund and to match it were given aid. I submit that is an unjust proposition, and I intend to substantiate what I have said concerning it by reading to you from the hearings before the Committee on Education. This is from the statement made by the Chief of the Agricultural Service, Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the Georgia director for vocational education, Mr. Chapman:

Doctor LANE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not know whether my time could be spent more profitably by telling

you more about what this work is than by you asking me questions. This chart you see on the wall here [indicating] is interesting because when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed in 1917 that chart was clean of red pins. Each red pin you see there represents a vocational agricultural department in a local high school.

Mr. TARVER. I notice in my own State of Georgia that in the northeastern section of the State there appear perhaps 100 pins around the locality of Athens, where the Georgia State Board for Vocational Training is located. The remainder of the State is very sparsely studded. In my own congressional district, which is in the northwestern corner of the State, I notice but one or two pins. May I inquire, Doctor, why so many vocational teachers should be located in the territory surrounding Athens and why there are so few scattered around over the remainder of the State?

Doctor LANE. I should like to call on Mr. Chapman, who is the director of the work in Georgia, to answer that question.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very glad to have an opportunity to explain why that condition exists. That is a further example of the authority that is vested in the local community in the development of this work. The Smith-Hughes Act, which was passed in 1917, stated that this money must be matched by State or by local funds. Until quite recently the State of Georgia did not match these funds from State appropriations, and in the development of this work we had to depend upon local communities quite largely to finance the work. The schools were selected on the basis of applications that came to the State board for vocational education through the local school officials, and we took care of those applications somewhat in the order in which they were received; and I would like to say that, unfortunately, I feel that this is a case, that very often this work was put in the communities that were best able to finance it rather than the communities that, perhaps, needed the work most.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chapman, at that point, if you will permit an interruption, would not that condition be obviated in the event this bill is passed and an amendment should be incorporated in the bill which would provide that instead of these Federal funds being matched by subdivisions of the State or by local school districts, or other subdivisions of the State, they should be matched by the State as a whole and the matter of the use of the funds of the State should be left entirely to the State boards for vocational education, so that they might use those funds in districts having the greatest need for this work, although those districts were not financially able to put up the funds to match the Federal funds?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes, sir; that could be done, and I might give you an example of the way this work has been administered in the State of Arkansas. Each State has its own plan for conducting this work, and each plan has its own basis of subsidizing or aiding the local communities where this work is carried on. In the State of Arkansas the State matched the entire agricultural fund that was provided under the Smith-Hughes Act, and they felt that since most of their communities in Arkansas were not able to finance the instruction themselves that it would be desirable for them to pay the entire salary of the agricultural teacher, and that is what they did; and the State board followed the same suggestion that was made by Judge TARVER in regard to the distribution of these schools. If we had decided, however, that that would have been the best thing to have done in Georgia, we would not have been able to do it, because the State until recently did not match any considerable portion of the Smith-Hughes fund.

Mr. TARVER. If, on the other hand, the State was not permitted to have subdivisions to match the fund, and the State found it necessary in order to get this money to match it themselves, don't you think the appropriation necessary would be easily obtained in Georgia?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am confident it would be obtained without any difficulty.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If I understand the gentleman's position, if the local communities did not contribute and your State did not make any appropriation, you would not get a dollar of this fund.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman does not understand my position, but if he will wait I think he will understand it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I thought I understood the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. No; the gentleman does not as yet. I have not developed my proposal.

Now, it is interesting to note in this connection that upon that map, studded with red pins, indicating the location of agricultural instructors, aided by Federal appropriations, there were 308 pins in the State of Georgia and that only 2 of those were located in my own congressional district. There are 12 congressional districts in the State. The director of that State for vocational education attempted to explain it by saying they found it necessary to put the work in the communities that were able to meet the Federal funds rather than in those where

Federal aid was needed the most. That may be one reason, but it is not, I am sure, all of the reasons which exist for distributing the vocational instructors in that way. My district compares favorably in material welfare and prosperity with other districts of my State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I have not gotten down to the proposition I intended to submit to the House as yet, and that is this, that the bill be amended so as to provide that the Federal aid shall be matched by the State as a whole and to cut out the provision relating to matching by local communities. I am not asking that as to the existing law. Let the \$6,000,000 you are paying out under the old law now go as it has been going, but so far as this small additional appropriation is concerned, of a half million dollars a year for five years and at the end of that time totaling \$2,500,000, let it go to those districts of the country which stand greatest in need of help of this character. There is no question but that if you provided that it should be matched by the States it would be matched by the States. I am going to offer an amendment providing that the funds shall be matched by the States and shall be used by the State boards for vocational education in those districts of the States standing in greatest need of aid, whether they are able to match the funds or not.

Gentlemen, will you let some of this money go to those sections of our country where poverty is? Will you let some of it go to the places where the direst need exists for educational opportunities, or will you insist that it continue to go as it has been going in large part in every part of this country, to communities that already have the means to take care of their own educational problems? Remember that in the remote rural sections of the United States there are boys and girls to-day whose intelligence, whose character, and whose qualities of manhood and womanhood compare favorably with those located in any other part of this great country of ours. Are you going to carry the help of vocational education to them, or are you going to say that it all must go to those who already have that material prosperity by which they can provide their own educational opportunities?

If you provide that only communities able to match the Federal fund shall get help, that is the effect of it.

This condition as to Georgia is not local to that State. As I said in opening my remarks, it exists in 35 States of the Union, according to the report which I held in my hand a moment ago and which lies here. Thirty-five of the 48 States of the Union failed to appropriate enough money to meet the Federal appropriation and that deficit is supplied by the local communities. I gave Georgia as an example because I am familiar with conditions as they exist in that State and I like to try to talk about things when I do talk that I think I know something about.

When this bill is read under the 5-minute rule I intend to offer this amendment. In my judgment it is a just amendment. In my judgment it is an amendment which ought to appeal to the mind and to the heart of every man who wants to do justly by the population of the remote rural sections of this country, and I ask, gentlemen, that you give it conscientious, serious consideration.

Of course, I shall be satisfied with your judgment whatever it may be, but I hope it may be that the children of these sections which are not now having any educational opportunity along this line, and will not under the present system, may be afforded some small chance by the adoption of this amendment to the proposed legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND], trusting him as to how much time he will use.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to say in the first place that I do not understand in what manner the director of the vocational board could determine as to what sections of any particular State needs this money more than others. I do not care to take issue with Judge TARVER in regard to what he says about the people of his district, which is in the northwestern portion of the State, not having received and will not receive the benefit of this fund, but he must not forget that within 100 miles of Athens, where I live and where the director lives, there are poor people there who likewise need their portion of this appropriation. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Athens is the seat of learning of the State of Georgia. [Applause.]

It has the oldest established-by-law university in the United States. The State normal school is located there. The State agricultural college is also located there, rated as about fifth

among the best colleges of its character in the United States. Besides these three State institutions of learning the city of Athens has one of the best high schools in the State. There is an agricultural college at Monroe and an agricultural college at Madison, each within 20 miles of Athens, and both in my congressional district. I think that the fact that more boys and girls take advantage of this vocational fund in my district than in the district my friend Judge TARVER has the honor to represent is due not to any discrimination on the part of the director, Mr. Chapman, in the distribution of this fund, but partly to the fact that Athens is the center of learning of Georgia, but also to the further fact that the parents in the rural sections of my district and the boys and girls themselves first had knowledge and likely became more familiar with this vocational proposition than the people in the remote sections of the State. [Applause.]

The bill as originally introduced by Senator GEORGE and as it passed the Senate provided for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories and authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the sum of \$500,000 and for each year thereafter for 11 years a sum exceeding by \$500,000 the sum appropriated for each preceding year. Annually thereafter there is a provision contained in the bill for a permanent authorization for an appropriation for each year the sum of \$6,000,000.

My understanding is when President Coolidge received information of the passage of this bill he protested against the appropriation, or the authorization of an appropriation for the period of 11 years. Under the presidential duress put into motion, we were given to understand that the bill should be amended, reducing the period of the appropriations from 11 years to 4 years, otherwise the bill would not become a law.

The "economy" question of the White House becomes very material when the beneficiaries of an appropriation are residents south of the Mason and Dixon line.

In the absence of this protest on the part of the Chief Executive, I am satisfied that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Education, Mr. REED of New York, one of the fairest and ablest Members of Congress, would have been perfectly willing for the 11-year appropriation to have remained in the bill.

The chief object of the bill, as shown by the bill itself and the report of the gentleman from New York, is to provide for the further development of the program of training farm boys and girls in agriculture and home economics in the several States.

All funds appropriated under the provisions of this bill are to be used solely for the purpose of extending the training prescribed in the Smith-Hughes Act which was passed by the Congress in February, 1917.

The Smith-Hughes Act, which was passed by the Congress 12 years ago, provides for the promotion of practical training as a part of the public-school program. It has for its main purpose the training of boys and girls to meet the real problems of life. It seeks to make our young people vocationally efficient. Under the stimulus given to practical training of boys and girls by this act, departments of vocational agriculture have been established in 3,590 schools in the rural sections of this country. Aid in maintaining departments of home economics has been extended to 1,973 schools.

The funds available under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act, which reached their maximum in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1926, have been sufficient to aid only 29 per cent of the rural high schools of the United States in maintaining vocational agriculture, and the meager funds provided for the aiding of home economics have been sufficient to place this type of training in only 8.7 per cent of the public high schools.

The Smith-Hughes Act provided, after 10 years of increasing appropriations, a maximum of \$3,000,000 for vocational agriculture and \$600,000 for home economics.

The bill under consideration is not legislation new or different in any way from that which is now in force. While it is important in the highest degree to the farmer boys and girls of the Nation, and while Senator GEORGE is entitled to full measure of credit for engineering it through the Senate, it simply authorizes appropriations of additional funds that will make it possible for additional rural districts to provide the practical type of training in their schools that is so essential to the welfare and prosperity of the country. The introduction of new and improved methods in farming, the increased use of machinery, together with the large scope of the farm business as it relates particularly to problems of marketing, distribution, consumption, and so forth, all point to the necessity of the coming generations being specifically trained to conduct successfully this ever-growing business.

Equally essential is training for the work of the farm home. Here, too, modern conveniences are contributing to improved methods in home making. Problems of selection, purchase, use, care, renovation, and maintenance of supplies and equipment to meet individual and family needs are sufficiently difficult to demand special training for their successful solution.

Provision in the public schools of the rural districts for training in home making is limited, and nowhere is such training more greatly needed. Not only do girls in these districts, as shown by statistics, marry younger than those in urban districts, but the farm home and the business of farming are so interrelated as to make success in the one dependent upon success in the other.

All boys who have taken advantage of the training under the Smith-Hughes Act, so far as it relates to agriculture, have carried out practical work on their home farms. It has meant an earning of \$23,637,924.25 during the past five years. The Federal Government has put into this investment, through salaries of teachers of vocational agriculture, during the same period only \$10,418,460. In other words, for every dollar of Federal funds spent in the enterprise there was a financial return of \$2.26 realized by the vocational boys.

The program of vocational agriculture has been in operation long enough to show whether or not the boys who graduate or pursue agricultural courses for at least one year are remaining in agricultural work. A recent nation-wide study made by the Federal Board for Vocational Education shows that from 60 to 75 per cent of the students given vocational instruction are now in agricultural work.

The teachers of vocational agriculture are of necessity in the closest contact with farming and farm life in their respective communities. They know the needs, longings, and aspirations of the farming population. They constitute a most favorable agency for the dissemination and utilization of the researches and findings of the United States Department of Agriculture and the 48 land-grant colleges and experiment stations.

Wherever vocational departments in home making have been placed in the schools, active cooperation exists between school and home. The instruction in the school is closely related to the work of the homes from which the girls come, and fathers and mothers are among the most ardent supporters of the program.

It is estimated that approximately 80 per cent of girls and women in the country are at some time home makers, and that about 1,000,000 marry annually. If these statistics even approach to the real situation, it can be said that all girls trained in this field in the public schools will probably at some time enter upon the work of home making.

While it is not possible in home making as it is in agriculture to assign money values to the influence of this vocational training on the home, it is safe to predict from observation of the results of the work that its extension to larger numbers of girls and women in the country would contribute greatly to their success as home makers; and since national prosperity is dependent to so large an extent upon good homes, the benefits would extend to the improvement of standards of living in the Nation as a whole.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to say to the members of the committee I am earnestly in favor of this legislation and my reason is because I have observed some of the benefits that have been derived from such legislation.

In my own congressional district we have had some vocational training experience that has been of great benefit to the farmers of that locality. We have not only had this benefit among the farmers but we have it in the industrial manufacturing centers as well. We have benefited by this vocational training in the factories and as a concrete example, recently there was located in Huntington a pants and overall factory from Baltimore.

The girls, when they first went to work in this factory, would earn five or six dollars a week. After having the advantages of vocational training for the short time of two or three weeks, their wages were increased to fifteen or twenty dollars a week. This was the result of vocational training in a manufacturing plant of which I have personal knowledge.

Now, I am going to give you another example with reference to the farmers. We had in my congressional district a large farm that had been owned and operated by a certain farmer for a great many years. The farmer had not made a success of this farm. He had not kept up with the new ideas brought out by the Department of Agriculture and announced through the bulletins which they issue. If he had known about them he would have been more prosperous in his farming. He sold this farm

to a man from Wisconsin. The man from Wisconsin and his boys had obtained a lot of information from vocational training and improved methods of farming. This Wisconsin man was farming this particular farm, not very far from where I live, and the man who formerly owned the farm went by and saw this man breaking up clods and he hollered over to him, "Brother, give 'em hell. I tried to make a living on that farm for 20 years, but if I wanted to make a living now I would go up to Huntington and get me a blind horse and a dray." This same farmer who came from Wisconsin and had the advanced ideas of farming raised on that farm 50 acres of tobacco which he sold to the American Tobacco Co. in the field for \$225 an acre. He raised 125 acres of potatoes and sold 125 bushels to the acre to the Frick Co., of Pittsburgh.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Did the gentleman say that he sold 50 acres of tobacco for \$2.25 an acre?

Mr. HUGHES. No; for \$225 an acre. The other farmers of that locality who had not taken advantage of vocational training and had not taken advantage of the valuable bulletins issued by the Government, only raised about 60 to 75 bushels to the acre of potatoes, where this man, who had taken advantage of the vocational training, had raised 125 bushels to the acre.

These are actual results. I did not think it was necessary to take the time of the House to say anything in favor of the bill, but there are certain questions that have been brought out by different gentlemen, and I want to say that I indorse everything that the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SNELL] has said, and especially what he said with reference to the committee which came to Washington from their convention in Philadelphia last month:

A committee of that organization from their convention in Philadelphia last month came to Washington, and I want to say they are a fine, representative lot of men. I have never met a committee of men who appealed to me as more interested in their work, had a greater desire to cooperate in every way with Congress, and only ask for the things they ought to ask for, than was this committee; and I was very much impressed with the personnel of the committee and the work they are doing. The country districts are especially interested in this vocational educational training, and let me say to the Members of the House that this, in my judgment, is a real farm-relief measure, if anything could be considered as such, because it helps to educate the young boys and girls in the country districts in the questions that arise in the management and conduct of the farm industry. For that reason I believe it is very important and should be considered. * * *

I also agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has so well expressed in giving the House the benefit of the advantages of this bill in his report, which is as follows:

[H. Rept. No. 1667, 70th Cong., 1st sess.]

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. REED of New York, from the Committee on Education, submitted the following report (to accompany S. 1731):

The Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (S. 1731) to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States, having considered said bill, reports favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass. This bill passed the Senate April 9, 1928.

S. 1731 is a bill to provide for the further development of the program of training of farm boys and girls in agriculture and home economics in the several States.

All funds appropriated under the provisions of this bill are to be used solely for the purpose of extending the training prescribed in the Smith-Hughes Act which was passed by the Congress in February, 1917.

The Smith-Hughes Act, which was passed by the Congress 11 years ago, provides for the promotion of practical training as a part of the public-school program. It has for its main purpose the training of boys and girls to meet the real problems of life. It seeks to make our young people vocationally efficient. Under the stimulus given to practical training by this act, departments of vocational agriculture have been established in 3,590 schools in the rural sections of this country. Aid in maintaining departments of home economics has been extended to 1,973 schools. The character of work that has been conducted in these schools has so commended itself by its practical character that a very large number of additional rural districts are now demanding assistance in the establishment of these departments.

The funds available under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act, which reached their maximum in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, have been sufficient to aid only 29 per cent of the rural high schools of the United States in maintaining vocational agriculture, and the meager funds provided for the aiding of home economics have been sufficient to place this type of training in only 8.7 per cent of the public high schools.

The Smith-Hughes Act provided, after 10 years of increasing appropriations, a maximum of \$3,000,000 for vocational agriculture and \$600,000 for home economics.

The bill S. 1731 is not legislation new or different in any way from that which is now in force. It simply authorizes the appropriations of additional funds that will make it possible for additional rural districts to provide the practical type of training in their schools that is so essential to the welfare and prosperity of the country. Most of these farming districts are not in a financial condition to provide further for this type of training without State and Federal assistance. The introduction of new and improved methods in farming, the increased use of machinery, together with the large scope of the farm business as it relates particularly to problems of marketing, distribution, consumption, etc., all point to the necessity of the coming generations being specifically trained to conduct successfully this complex and ever-growing business.

Equally essential is training for the work of the farm home. Here, too, modern conveniences are contributing to improved methods in home making. Problems of selection, purchase, use, care, renovation, and maintenance of supplies and equipment to meet individual and family needs are sufficiently difficult to demand special training for their successful solution.

Provision in the public schools of the rural districts for training in home making is limited, and nowhere is such training more greatly needed. Not only do girls in these districts, as shown by statistics, marry younger than those in urban districts, but the farm home and the business of farming are so interrelated as to make success in the one dependent upon success in the other.

All boys who have taken advantage of the training under the Smith-Hughes Act, so far as it relates to agriculture, have carried out practical work on their home farms. It has meant an earning of \$23,637,924.25 during the past five years. The Federal Government has put into this investment, through salaries of teachers of vocational agriculture, during the same period only \$10,418,460. In other words, for every dollar of Federal funds spent in the enterprise there was a financial return of \$2.26 realized by the vocational boys.

Do the boys become farmers? The program of vocational agriculture has been in operation long enough to show whether or not the boys who graduate or pursue agricultural courses for at least one year are remaining in agricultural work. A recent nation-wide study made by the Federal Board for Vocational Education shows that from 60 to 75 per cent of the students given vocational instruction are now in agricultural work.

The teachers of vocational agriculture are of necessity in the closest contact with farming and farm life in their respective communities. They know the needs, longings, and aspirations of the farming population. They constitute a most favorable agency for the dissemination and utilization of the researches and findings of the United States Department of Agriculture and the 48 land-grant colleges and experiment stations.

Wherever vocational departments in home making have been placed in the schools, active cooperation exists between school and home. The instruction in the school is closely related to the work of the homes from which the girls come, and fathers and mothers are among the most ardent supporters of the program.

It is estimated that approximately 80 per cent of girls and women in the country are at some time home makers, and that about 1,000,000 marry annually. If these statistics even approach to the real situation, it can be said that all girls trained in this field in the public schools will probably at some time enter upon the work of home making.

While it is not possible in home making as it is in agriculture to assign money values to the influence of this vocational training on the home, it is safe to predict from observation of the results of the work that its extension to larger numbers of girls and women in the country would contribute greatly to their success as home makers; and since national prosperity is dependent to so large an extent upon good homes, the benefits would extend to the improvement of standards of living in the Nation as a whole.

It was very forcefully brought to the attention of the Committee on Education that there is an unusually widespread interest in this bill throughout the Nation. The bill has the indorsement of agricultural leaders, educators, the farm press, and the national farm organizations, as well as such women's clubs and organizations as the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the American Association of University Women. It is indorsed by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

This bill does not initiate any new principle of Federal participation. It merely extends the benefits now enjoyed by many rural communities to other farm communities not now receiving such benefits.

I am in favor of the bill, and I certainly hope it will pass. I am in favor of the amendment adopted by the Senate, because I feel it is necessary. Otherwise it might endanger the passage of the bill, and I am sure that at the end of five years the Congress, after knowing the valuable results obtained from this legislation, will be glad and willing to extend the time. This will give to the youth of the rural sections of the country a great opportunity to develop the natural resources of the rural sections and build up a better citizenship in intelligence, in en-

lightenment, and will provide a better opportunity than the farmers of our day had, and it is to this class that we must look to do things in the future. In order for the farmer to make a success of farming, it is absolutely necessary that he keep up with the latest and most improved facilities. When he does this the farmer then has a hard time of it.

I feel that this bill will have a tendency to keep the boy on the farm, and that certainly will be a good thing for the boy and for the country as well.

Mr. TARVER, from Georgia, has certainly given some valuable information, and I am quoting this part of his remarks, and right here I want to insert the statement which was made by Doctor Lane to the committee at the hearings:

Every boy who elects to take the vocational work as part of his high-school education is required to carry on for at least six months at home some definite, practical work under the supervision of his teacher. Now, that means an economic return on the part of the boys in the production of livestock or crops or some other work around a farm.

The total labor income from this practical work during the past five years was \$23,637,924.25. This is not an estimate. It is based upon accurate cost accounting. For every dollar of Federal funds spent for vocational agriculture there was a financial return of \$2.25 realized by the boys from their labor. The total Federal fund spent for salaries of teachers of vocational agriculture during the 5-year period was \$10,418,460, and there was realized \$23,637,924.25 from the practical work the boys did.

[Applause.]

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am heartily in favor of the defeat of this bill. I spoke against the original bill in this House on May 19, 1924. I want to ask you to pause for a moment and consider our relations to legislation in this House. As all will admit, we have no power to pass any bill in this House where the power is not given by the Constitution directly, or by direct implication. I challenge any gentleman on the floor of this House to point out to me a provision of the Constitution that gives Congress the power to legislate on education. Where is it? Speak up. It can not be found. Not only is it not found there but it was in open convention offered to the convention and declined; and yet there are gentlemen who are attempting to hold that the so-called general welfare clause covers education, when those who made the Constitution had it specifically proposed to them by a committee of the convention and they declined to accept it. Is it not attenuated logic that can see in the words "to provide for the general welfare" a right to legislate on a subject which was proposed in the convention when the convention refused to put it in the Constitution among the grants of power?

On the 18th of August, 1787, during the progress of the convention, when they were considering the Pinckney plan, which contained no grants of power to Congress over education or agriculture, a committee of the body proposed forty-odd additional propositions to be added to the powers of Congress already contained in that plan. One of these provisions gave Congress the power to legislate on education. It read as follows:

To establish seminaries for the promotion of literature and the arts and sciences. (Journal of the Federal Convention, Boston, 1819, p. 260.)

Another was as follows:

To establish public institutions, rewards, immunities, for the promotion of agriculture, commerce, trades, and manufactures. (Id. p. 261.)

Another proposing a council of state for the President composed of the following officers:

1. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who shall, from time to time, recommend such alterations of, and additions to, the laws of the United States, as may in his opinion be necessary to the due administration of justice, and such as may promote useful learning and inculcate sound morality throughout the Union.

2. The secretary of domestic affairs, who shall be appointed by the President, and hold his office during pleasure. It shall be his duty to attend to matters of general police, the state of agriculture and manufactures, the opening of roads and navigation, and the facilitating communications through the United States.

There are other propositions looking in the same direction. Not one of the above ever appeared in the Constitution; but see how striking is this last proposition, section 2; for, among the duties assigned to the secretary of domestic affairs, the matters of roads and navigation and communications throughout the United States were incorporated in the Constitution,

but the matters of "general police", the state of agriculture and manufactures embraced in the same section were never mentioned, while roads and navigation and commerce, put side by side with the matters of general police, agriculture, and manufactures, were inserted in the Constitution.

This is a powerful vindication of our position. These questions were submitted openly to the Convention with the appeal of a committee to add them to the congressional powers, and they were rejected and they were never heard of afterwards. Where do we get the power to-day to do this thing? Some gentleman says, "Well, we have always been doing it."

I do not recognize that argument. That is the bootlegger's argument. [Laughter and applause.]

A man that advances it may not be the bootlegger as we understand it, but he is using the bootlegger's argument. Where do you get the power? I am not asking you to take my view of it. I ask you to hear three of the greatest judges who ever sat on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States. In the great case of *Gibbons against Ogden* (1. Wheat. 187), decided by Chief Justice Marshall, discussing the taxing power of the States and the taxing power of the Federal Government—for this was not obiter dictum—said:

In imposing taxes for State purposes the States are not doing what Congress is empowered to do. Congress is not empowered to tax for those purposes which are within the exclusive power of the States.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. TUCKER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman thinks that the general welfare clause would not apply?

Mr. TUCKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin understand the general welfare clause to give Congress the right to legislate on any subject it deems proper?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. TUCKER. As I understand the question of my friend from Wisconsin he is running on the old exploded idea that that proposition means that Congress has the power to legislate on anything it may deem for the welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman must not impute any opinion to me—I asked the gentleman a question.

Mr. TUCKER. I am trying to get the gentleman's opinion for this reason. Mr. Hamilton in June, 1787, introduced into the convention a proposition giving Congress the power to legislate on all subjects, State and national. It was given but scant consideration and that proposition was voted down directly or indirectly five times during the convention, and yet gentlemen come here and say a proposition which was voted down five times is still alive; that it has as many lives as a cat. Whatever may be the general welfare clause, if there is such, and I do not think there is such a clause, that is Judge Marshall's opinion, for he says that Congress has no power "to levy taxes for those purposes exclusively within the power of the States," and confessedly education is a State function.

I take you a little further. In 1842 in the great case of *Dobbins v. The Commissioners of Erie County* (16 Peters, 448) Judge Wayne delivered the unanimous opinion of the court, and in that court sat Chief Justice Taney and Judge Story agreeing with him. In that unanimous decision the court held, speaking of the taxing power:

The revenue of the United States is intended by the Constitution to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; to be expended, in particular [that is, to be more particular] in carrying into effect the laws made to execute all the express powers "and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United."

In 1868 Chief Justice Chase rendered a decision in the case of *Veazie Bank v. Fenno* (8 Wall. 541), in which he said, speaking of the taxing power:

There are, indeed, certain virtual limitations, arising from the principles of the Constitution itself. It will undoubtedly be an abuse of the power if so exercised as to impair the separate existence and independent self-government of the States, or if exercised for ends inconsistent with the limited grants of power in the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I rest my case right there. Here is Marshall, the Federalist, Taney, the Democrat, Chase, the Lincoln Republican, "a trinity in unity" agreeing on one thing, namely, that there is no power in Congress to lay a tax for any purpose that belongs exclusively to the States. On that granitic foundation I stand. If we can not follow that trio we had better surrender our charter and go out of business.

I hear a great deal about the constant violation of the Constitution and a certain law, known as the Volstead law. How do we answer charges like this? Have each of us our own "little pet" violations of the Constitution, possessing a far-off beneficent hue which we readily excuse, while deploring with pitiless tears those ruthless violators of other sections which we have no inclination to disregard? Are we following the doctrine of Hudibras who said:

We compound for sins we are inclined to
By damning those we have no mind to.

The breaking of the Constitution is just as fatal in the vocational educational bill as it is in the Volstead law. I am against all such legislation, such as child labor laws, educational laws and maternity laws, because they are unconstitutional, and if we Democrats ever expect to redeem the old Party, we must go back to the Constitution and stand by it steadfastly and firmly. [Applause.]

In extending my remarks by permission I beg to refer briefly to the constitutional argument submitted by my friend, the chairman of the committee, Mr. REED of New York.

In my remarks at the outset I challenged the production of a power in Congress under which this bill could pass. There was no response to that challenge, and I doubt not my friend felt that it was necessary at least to make a gesture on this subject, and he introduces the usual gesture, that the authority comes from the so-called general welfare clause, and he quotes Judge Story as indorsing that view. In the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of December 13, 1927, is recorded a speech I made entitled "Judge Story's Position on the General Welfare Clause," to which I ask the consideration of any who are interested in this subject. I merely quote below sections 909 and 910 of Judge Story's great work to show that Judge Story, from my examination of the matter and which is set forth in the above speech, in his commentaries took two inconsistent positions, which can not be reconciled, for sections 909 and 910 are certainly unanswerable. The sections are as follows:

Sec. 909. The Constitution was from its very origin contemplated to be a frame of a national government of special and enumerated powers, and not general and unlimited powers. This is apparent, as will be presently seen, from the history of the proceedings of the Convention which framed it, and it has formed the admitted basis of all legislative and judicial reasoning upon it ever since it was put into operation by all who have been its open friends and advocates, as well as by all who have been its enemies and opponents. If the clause "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" is construed to be an independent and substantive grant of power, it not only renders wholly unimportant and unnecessary the subsequent enumeration of specific powers, but it plainly extends far beyond them and creates a general authority in Congress to pass all laws which they may deem for the common defense or general welfare. Under such circumstances the Constitution would practically create an unlimited national government. The enumerated powers would tend to embarrassment and confusion, since they would only give rise to doubts as to the true extent of the general power or of the enumerated powers.

Sec. 910. One of the most common maxims of interpretation is (as has been already stated), that, as an exception strengthens the force of a law in cases not excepted, so enumeration weakens it in cases not enumerated. But, how could it be applied with success to the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States if the enumerated powers were neither exceptions from, nor additions to, the general power to provide for the common defense and general welfare? To give the enumeration of the specific powers any sensible place or operation in the Constitution, it is indispensable to construe them, as not wholly and necessarily embraced in the general power. The common principles of interpretation would seem to instruct us that the different parts of the same instrument ought to be so expounded as to give meaning to every part which will bear it. Shall one part of the same sentence be excluded altogether from a share in the meaning; and shall the more doubtful and indefinite terms be retained in their full extent, and the clear and precise expressions be denied any signification? For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power? Nothing is more natural or common than first to use a general phrase, and then to qualify it by a recital of particulars. But the idea of an enumeration of particulars which neither explain nor qualify the general meaning, and can have no other effect than to confound and mislead, is an absurdity, which no one ought to charge on the enlightened authors of the Constitution. It would be to charge them either with premeditated folly or premeditated fraud.

The next reliance my friend offers is the report of Mr. Hamilton on manufactures in 1791, in which he states that—there seems no reason to doubt that whatever concerns the general interests of learning, of agriculture, of manufactures, and of commerce

are within the sphere of the national councils as far as regards an application of money.

I think to rely upon Mr. Hamilton in this matter is quite unfortunate; and I think I can show that Mr. Hamilton's testimony as above given is worth little or nothing.

First, Mr. Hamilton in the above expression states that "learning, agriculture, manufactures, and commerce are within the sphere of the national councils as far as regards an application of money"; that is, Congress can make appropriations for such. In the preceding part of this speech I have quoted the instances where propositions relating to learning, education, agriculture, etc., were submitted to the Constitutional Convention to be placed among the powers granted to Congress, but they were not adopted, while other powers suggested at the same time were adopted. Is not that sufficient to show that no such power exists?

Second, On the 4th of September the committee of 11 reported that clause 1 of section 1, Article VII of the Pinckney plan should read:

The legislature shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

This was adopted without a dissenting vote. The Pinckney plan, which had been adopted on the 16th of August, merely provided that "The legislature shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises"; followed by the other grants of power. The reasons for inserting these words "to pay the debts," and so forth, are given in my speech above referred to, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 13, 1927, under the heading of "In Conclusion." Now the claim is made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the chairman of the Committee on Education of this House, that these words constitute a substantive grant of power to Congress to pass all and any laws affecting the general welfare of the people of the United States; and while Judge Story, in a luminous argument, shows such a claim to be preposterous, he claims that, under these words, Congress may make appropriations for any object which in their judgment they may believe to be for the common defense or general welfare of the people of the United States—that is, that Congress can appropriate money to an institution that it is denied the power to create.

The question, therefore, is brought sharply to this issue: Did the men constituting this committee of 11 intend, by the insertion of these words, to destroy the Pinckney plan containing only specific grants of power to Congress, which had been passed unanimously by the convention without a single negative vote on the 16th of August previously? An examination of this committee will show that the majority of them could never have agreed to any such proposition. The known sentiments of at least seven of them, and probably nine, show conclusively that their insertion of these words was never considered by them as authorizing the construction put upon them by the Hamiltonians, or by the learned Judge Story.

Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, was one of the most distinguished men of his day. On the 16th of June, 1798, as a Member of Congress, he made a speech on this clause, in which he said:

He (Gallatin) was well informed that these words had originally been inserted in the Constitution as a limitation to the power of laying taxes. After the limitation had been agreed to, and the Constitution was completed, a member of the convention (he was one of the members who represented the State of Pennsylvania), being one of a committee of revisal and arrangement, attempted to throw these words into a distinct paragraph, so as to create not a limitation, but a distinct power. The trick, however, was discovered by a member from Connecticut, now deceased, and the words restored as they now stand. So that Mr. Gallatin said, whether he referred to the Constitution itself, to the most able defenders of it, or to the State conventions, the only rational construction which could be given to that clause was that it was a limitation, and not an extension of powers. (U. S. Annals of Congress, 5th Cong., 1797-1799, vol. 8, p. 1796.)

For confirmation of the above see The Framing of the Constitution, Max Farrand, page 182.

It is of interest to note that Abraham Baldwin, a member of this committee, was a member of the Federal Convention and a Member of the same Congress (the Fifth) that Gallatin was, and engaged with him in this debate, and he doubtlessly heard Gallatin's statement, and there was no denial of it from him.

Who was the member from Pennsylvania in the convention who attempted this "trick"? It is easy to ascertain who he was. In being designated as one of a committee of revisal and arrangement in the convention we find that the member from Pennsylvania on that committee was Gouverneur Morris. And

who was the member from Connecticut that discovered the "trick"? By the process of elimination this is easily discovered because Mr. Gallatin said "he is now dead." The Gallatin words were spoken in 1798. Johnson, Ellsworth, and Roger Sherman were the members of the convention from Connecticut. Johnson and Ellsworth died after 1800, and Roger Sherman died in 1793; and Roger Sherman, who detected this "trick," was a member of this committee of 11 that brought in this report, and, having prevented Morris from making the change by throwing these words into a distinct paragraph, it showed first that Sherman was opposed to the unlimited power attempted to be given to these words by Morris's "trick," and, second, that Morris was trying to make the change to carry out Hamilton's idea, because the clause as adopted September 4 was fatal to Hamilton's desire for unlimited powers.

This "trick" described by Mr. Gallatin as attempted by Gouverneur Morris arose out of the fact that on the 8th of September the convention appointed a committee "of five to revise the style and arrange the articles agreed to by the House." The committee was composed of Samuel Johnson, Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, Madison, and King, and on the 12th of September that committee made its report and article 1, section 8, appears as follows:

Sec. 8. The Congress may, by joint ballot, appoint a treasurer. They shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; To pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, etc. (Journal of Federal Convention, Boston, 1819.)

Had the Constitution been ratified in that form, there would be considerable ground for asserting that it contained the Hamiltonian idea of unlimited power, for here these words are taken from a dependent position in the first clause of section 8 as a part of it, and have no relation to the power of taxation as set forth in that clause, and are entirely divorced from this clause, and by their location are made an independent, separate clause, and become one of the substantive grants of power to Congress, just as the other 17 grants in this sentence.

This report made by the committee on style was made to the convention on September 12. The Constitution was voted on and adopted by the convention on the 15th of September, but between those two dates the Journal makes no further mention of it and there is no other reference to it in the Journal, but when the Constitution appeared as finally signed by the members this clause was unchanged and was in the exact form adopted by the convention on the 4th of September. The attempt to change it had failed. This committee on style in the dying hours of the convention that proposed this Hamiltonian power for Congress, which had been rejected four times before this by the convention, has an unknown genesis—unless it may be found in Roger Sherman's discovery—and its paternity is also unknown, for its proponent in the convention (September 8) is not given in the Journal, but only the featureless words "It was moved and seconded." Who was the mover of the resolution? And what was the necessity for the committee? Three of its members (Morris, Madison, and King) were all members of the committee of 11, one from each State, appointed August 31, that had large and complete powers to deal not only with what already had been acted upon but what might yet be considered by the convention. This much at least is known, that a majority of the five were Hamiltonians, and the failure of their report presented on the 12th of September on this section was the expiring gasp of centralized power in its failure to incorporate imperial power in the Constitution of the United States.

The constitution to-day as it came from the convention has this clause just as it was adopted on the 4th of September, 1787, in that convention. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and those who follow him claim that in this form Congress is empowered to legislate for any purpose that they think is for the good of the people. I appeal from the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] to Mr. Hamilton. If that clause adopted on the 4th of September, 1787, contained the power claimed for it by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] to-day it was practically the proposed power supplied by Mr. Hamilton in his draft of a constitution, that Congress should—have power to pass all laws which they shall judge necessary to the common defense and general welfare of the Union.

Did Mr. Hamilton believe that the clause adopted September 4 contained this unlimited power introduced in the convention in June? His proposition had scarcely been discussed in the convention at all. The Pinckney plan of specific powers

had held the center of the stage from the 6th of August. The Randolph and Patterson plans had been discarded. The Pinckney plan on this subject, brought into the convention on the 6th of August, was passed without a dissenting vote on the 16th of August. So that the convention, to carry out the theory of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], adopted the Pinckney plan on the 16th of August in direct opposition to Hamilton's plan; and then on the 4th of September, by the insertion of the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare" in the first grant of power in this section reestablished the original Hamiltonian proposal of unlimited power to Congress; and then mirabile dictu placed it in the very bowels of a specific grant to Congress to lay taxes, between the grant and a limitation upon that grant, undoing all of the work that had been done in the adoption of the Pinckney plan without opposition, as well as violating every principle of grammatical construction.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may think that; but did Mr. Hamilton? If so, why was it that on the 8th day of September, 1787, a new committee, a majority of whom were Hamiltonians, one of them Mr. Hamilton himself, another Gouverneur Morris, his right-hand man, was appointed on revision and style; and on the 12th of September brought in a report that changed this provision, disemboweling the expression "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare," from the grant to lay taxes, and setting it apart, down below the power to levy taxes, separated from it by a semicolon and making it a distinct substantive grant. Why should Hamilton through Gouverneur Morris, resort to that method to obtain an end which the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] says had already been obtained on the 4th of September? Why was Gouverneur Morris induced to resort to what Mr. Gallatin called a "trick" to accomplish for Mr. Hamilton what the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] says they already had? Argument is useless.

The action of the convention in rejecting it was the final blow; and yet, in the quotation from Mr. Hamilton's report on manufactures, above cited, made within four years from the time of this action in the convention he asserts in that report that learning, education, commerce, etc., could be reached by appropriations by Congress which he and Gouverneur Morris felt was not the case when the convention adjourned with their failure to have their report adopted changing the form adopted September 4, 1787.

Third, I have said that the Hamilton plan, giving Congress unlimited power to legislate on any bill that seemed to it for the good of the people, had been voted down directly or indirectly five times during the convention. I give you, to show this, these propositions and citations from the Journal of the Federal Convention.

1. On the 17th of July a resolution by Mr. Sherman.
2. On the 16th of August, when the Pinckney plan was adopted, which contained only definite and specific powers for Congress, which being limited in number, was the exact counterpart of Hamilton's unlimited proposal.
3. On the 22d of August Robert Morris and Rutledge of South Carolina offered amendments to give Congress the power "to fulfill the engagements and discharge the debts of the United States." This was clearly in direct opposition to Hamilton's proposition, for what engagements had the United States? Chiefly the 18 specific grants found in the Pinckney plan, which had been adopted on August 16, six days before.
4. On the 25th of August Mr. Sherman's resolution plainly upholding Hamilton's plan was rejected; Connecticut alone voting yea.
5. Then on the 12th of September the committee which had been appointed on the 8th of September to revise and arrange the articles of the Constitution, consisting of Johnson, Hamilton, G. Morris, Madison, and King, reported to the convention a substitute for Article I, section 8, adopted on the 4th of September (which is the language of the present Constitution) the following:

ARTICLE I

SEC. 8. The Congress may, by joint ballot, appoint a Treasurer. They shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; To pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; To regulate commerce; To coin money.

And so forth, and so forth.

Had this proposition been adopted by the convention to take the place of the clause adopted September 4, which is now the present Constitution, my friend from New York would have something to base his claim of constitutionality upon for

this bill. It not only was not adopted; it was never considered. The subject was never discussed in the convention after it was offered; and after these five rejections of Mr. Hamilton's proposal to give Congress unlimited power to appropriate money, by what authority can it be claimed that such a power exists in the Constitution?

Justice Brewer, in the case of *Fairbanks v. United States* (181 U. S. 1), where a construction of the Constitution was urged, which had been rejected in the convention framing the Constitution, said:

In other words, the purpose of the restriction is that exportation, all exportation, shall be free from national burden. This intent, although obvious from the language of the clause itself, is reinforced by the fact that in the constitutional convention Mr. Clymer moved to insert after the word "duty," the words "for the purpose of revenue," but the motion was voted down. So it is clear that the framers of the Constitution intended not merely that exports should not be made a source of revenue to the National Government, but that the National Government should put nothing in the way of burden upon such exports.

In the same great case the same great judge, in discussing what is called "the practical construction of the Constitution," arising from the fact that officers of the Government have construed the Constitution in one way, and Congress itself has passed a number of similar bills, uses this striking language:

We have no disposition to belittle the significance of this matter. It is always entitled to careful consideration and in doubtful cases will, as we have shown, often turn the scale; but when the meaning and scope of a constitutional provision are clear, it can not be overthrown by legislative action, although several times repeated and never before challenged.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened with great interest to the most eloquent appeal from our distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] asserting that this measure is unconstitutional. In the few minutes I have at my disposal I shall not attempt to enter at length into a discussion of the constitutionality of this question. In fact, my friend from Virginia is always so delightful in his opposition to these great programs of progress, that it requires some effort to oppose him. The gentleman harks back to the days before 1861. All well and good. But this great country has moved up and has taken some great strides in the way of progress since those days, however glorious they may have been. Washington and Madison urged the Congress of the United States to appropriate money to advance the cause of education in this country. Congress years and years ago provided the land-grant funds with which to establish agricultural and mechanical colleges in every State in the Union, and they have been established. Congress created a Bureau of Education and has been providing funds for its support through all the years. Congress created the Department of Agriculture that reaches out and looks after the pigs, cattle, and sheep, the Johnson grass and the barberry bush and the boll weevil and the corn borer and many other things, and Congress has been providing funds for these activities for a half century. My distinguished friend has been living in this country all of that time and has held membership in this House for many years, and I am wondering why he does not go into the Federal courts and have the acts declared invalid, instead of permitting Congress to continue throughout all the years to violate the Constitution, as he says. If we can reach out and look after the moose in Alaska and the sheep and the hogs and the Johnson grass and the boll weevil and the corn borer, it seems to me that we have a right under the Constitution to reach out under the "general welfare" clause and do something for the boys and girls of the Nation. [Applause.]

That is what we are undertaking to do in this bill. The gentleman from Virginia urges help for agriculture. In the many years of his fine service in this House I am satisfied that he has been voting for appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for bills that provide for the Bureau of Education. If this vocational education is not authorized by the Constitution, neither is either one of those activities of the Government authorized by the Constitution.

I strongly favor this particular legislation. I want to do something for agriculture. Here we propose to go out into the rural communities and not only train the minds but train the hands of the boys and girls of America. We are trying here to reach down from the top and help agriculture, and, in my humble opinion, we are going to help agriculture more when we get down with the boys and girls and train them properly than

we can in any other way, because you will then enable them to solve these problems in a way that we may never be able to solve them ourselves.

Why, I can remember well when I was a lad out on a farm we did not know what caused chickens to have "limber neck." We did not know what to do for it. We were giving them this thing and that thing. The cause was a simple thing. It was caused by the fowls eating decayed flesh. All that was necessary was to keep decayed flesh away from the chickens and there was no more limber neck. This legislation has been especially attractive to the people of my State. I have had opportunity to observe its workings and you should see the interest that has developed on the farm, in the schools, in the homes, and everywhere. It seems to me we have been trying to make lawyers and doctors and teachers and preachers out of too many people who are not interested and have neglected to train these young folks who desire to follow vocational pursuits. We must give the boys and girls on the farm and in the homes in the rural sections a chance.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. COLLINS. We are spending millions of dollars a year in training boys and girls in the schools of the country in a military way. I have not heard any objection to that. What is the difference in the two?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I think it quite as essential to the national defense and to the general welfare of this country to train our boys and girls in agriculture and home economics as to train them for war. We need more good farmers and good home builders.

I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] that our forefathers in writing the Constitution, after they had named 14 activities in which the Federal Government should participate as proper activities on the part of the Federal Government, concluded with the statement "and to provide for the general welfare." This certainly did not refer to providing for courts, for armies, for navies, and the like. They had already declared those things in specific terms; but in their wisdom they must have realized that this country was young and in the years to come would develop along many lines. They provided for a covering clause "the general welfare," so that as new conditions should arise or activities that were not considered by them that the American people deemed for the general welfare Congress should have the power to make suitable provision, and under this general-welfare clause we have created the Department of Agriculture, other departments, and the Bureau of Education. As I recall, our Government started with but three departments. Now we have 10.

This bill, providing for vocational training of our boys and girls in the rural sections, on the farms, and in the homes, has just as much sanction of the Constitution as has the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau of Education.

We reach out and look after the moose in Alaska; we provide for the education of the Indians; we give the most careful attention to crops and to animals on the farm. We have been doing these things for years. Why should we now hesitate to provide suitable training for the boys and girls in the rural sections and make the farm and the home more attractive and give to these boys and girls the opportunities that boys and girls have in the cities, so that they may be more on an equality with the boys and girls in the cities and be able to meet the problems of life?

The money provided by the Federal Government for vocational education in Kentucky has been under a most capable man, Mr. Ivan Barnes, and his administration has been most successful and the results all that could be desired.

In looking after the boys and girls of the Nation I think we are undoubtedly providing for the general welfare of our country. If you want to help agriculture and the farmers of this country, vote for this measure and help the boys and girls on the farms. [Applause.]

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I expect to support the bill, but, apprehending that approval of the bill might be construed as an indorsement of the constitutional argument upon which it is based by the gentleman who just addressed the House, the gentleman from Kentucky, I have craved the privilege of a few minutes to explain my views in reference to the constitutional feature of just such a proposition, and it is this: I deny that the "general-welfare" clause as referred to here confers any specific power. The general-welfare clause was a résumé by way of brief reference to all the preceding 18 powers that had been specifically enumerated. So that it means this: That the Congress is authorized to levy

taxes and to exercise the specific powers theretofore enumerated, so that by the exercise of those powers it may promote the "general welfare." But I am going to vote for the bill. How am I to be consistent? I sat as a student at the feet of Gamaliel, a great constitutional lawyer, such as the distinguished learned gentleman from Virginia is, and when this Smith-Hughes Act was first enacted I, as a private citizen and practitioner, had my "constitutional morality" terribly shocked, and I came to the House with considerable misgivings about what would be my attitude when after having stood here with elevated hand and had sworn to defend the Constitution of the United States, whether or not I could support such legislation as this.

But I confess, as many other Members have confessed in my hearing, that a term or two of service here is quite a liberal education. Our ideas become very materially liberalized, and I confess now that I can see the light in a way that I did not quite see it when I confined my vision strictly to the text of the decisions by Marshall and Taney and Cooley and other great constitutional lights.

Now, here is a proposition that seems to my mind to be as simple as it can be. It is true the Federal Government is based upon a Constitution of limited powers. By that it means "limited in number," and not limited in extent of the few powers that are given. Because every power given to the Federal Government is in itself absolutely unlimited. It is a whole, complete power of Government to the extent to which such governmental powers are conferred.

Now, the first essential, indispensable power of any government, as every one of these great judges has held from first to last, is this, the power of self-preservation, the power of self-maintained security; and I submit that the life, the firmness, the stability, and the perpetuity of this Government rests upon the farms and the homes of the Nation. [Applause.] And since this bill proposes to encourage farm information and farm interests and farm skill and knowledge of the home, and how to conduct and carry on the home work wisely, so as to promote health and happiness in the home, it is thereby promoting the security, the life, the integrity, the fundamental essence of the very Nation itself. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am for this legislation because by means of it the farm boys and girls throughout the land will have opportunity to acquire a knowledge of agricultural economics and administration. In other words, they will acquire the knowledge of how to make the farm pay.

There is a conspicuous lack among the farming communities of the land of this particular character of education. Of course we might say that there are other lines of industry where there is also a lack of economic and business knowledge concerning the industry in which people are engaged. The banking business might be mentioned as one of those in this particular class of education. The young men and the young women should be taught economics as well as how to cultivate and how to produce certain crops. The unwisdom of spending much time and much effort and much money on nonproductive lines certainly should be taught to the young men and young women contemplated by the provisions of this bill.

In our great agricultural State much effort is being made by the director of vocational education in extending this character of education to every part of the State. And now I wish to quote, if I may, what our director has to say on this particular subject. He says:

We are asking this legislation because we have reached the limit of expansion of our program in our State. We are reaching 100 rural high schools out of a possible 400, and we are reaching 2,000 boys out of a possible 8,000 boys. I am talking of farm boys. We are seeking this education in order to extend this training to communities in Kansas to which it has not been extended.

C. M. MILLER,

State Director of Vocational Education, Topeka, Kans.

I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it shall not be my purpose to indulge in any discussion of the constitutionality of this measure, as requested by the gen-

tleman from New Jersey. I am glad we shall have the support of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN]. I am glad of the conclusion he has reached, but I am not so profoundly impressed with the reasoning by which he arrives at his conclusion. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] paid a splendid compliment to those who have so zealously pressed this legislation. He stated that they had presented the merits of this bill before the Committee on Rules very creditably.

I wish to say that the department of education of the great State of Ohio deserves a lot of credit for assisting in laying the groundwork of that splendid sentiment. The State of Ohio is entitled to compliments for its part in the furtherance of this measure, and these distinguished schoolmen who have been so forward in that work are to be complimented. I have said what I rose to say, and will yield the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I do not desire to go into the constitutionality of the bill. I do not think it is necessary. I would like to remind my colleagues of the fact that the State which I, in part, represent appropriates for the control of floods and to reclaim lands, and those appropriations will, we hope, be met by the Federal Government funds. I likewise believe it is the duty of the Federal Government to foster education for the rural districts. If you will show me rural districts of any State where you have an educated people, I will show you a people who are preserving their social institutions. If you will show me an enlightened citizenship, I will show you that its education leads it forward in every other way. I do not believe that education and wisdom increases misery but believe that it dispels misery. I believe in light and education. When education is fostered, you foster the wealth and the ability of the people; it goes to make usefulness and happiness. I am glad that the Committee on Rules saw fit to bring in a rule for the passage of this additional appropriation.

I would be glad if the Committee on Education would bring out a bill providing for a department of public education, with a secretary in the President's Cabinet. I have introduced such a bill, and I trust that it or some similar bill may be brought from the Committee on Education giving governmental approval of public education in the United States.

My friends, the subject of education is one in which we should all be interested. It is one of importance to the rank and file. The rural communities of our Nation are those which in the past have been neglected as far as vocational education is concerned, but now they are becoming enlightened. Good roads go all through them; power lines have been carried through them; telephone lines have been built through the rural communities, and now if you carry to them the educational opportunities that have heretofore been given to the cities and large centers of population you are going to see a great, safe, and powerful people rise and carry on their share of our Government's burden. I say, give to the youth of our land equal educational opportunities, regardless of whether he lives in country or city. [Applause.]

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, but I believe I have a little time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much of that time as I may desire to use. [Applause.]

A southern negro said, "You know, Massa Jim, he said sandy land makes the best 'tatoes and I say so, too, and we just argued about it all day." Well, it seems we are "argufying" here for two hours on something about which we are all agreed, with one very honorable exception. I respect his scruples, but do not agree entirely with his conclusions.

On the general subject of vocational education I want to read a brief passage from a speech delivered by Edward T. Franks, vice chairman of the Federal Board for Vocational Education. This vocational education experiment has been tried out, perhaps, more thoroughly in our cities and larger towns and in industrial and manufacturing centers that it has been tried out in agricultural centers. I think the agricultural districts would have been better off had we had more of it and had it come into effect at an earlier date. Mr. Franks says:

The vocational students in the Central Vocational School of Milwaukee, Wis., earn more money each year while attending school than the entire educational system costs the City of Milwaukee for all kinds of education.

That is a most startling statement. Furthermore:

There were 63,600 part-time vocational students in the city of New York, and they earned annually while attending school \$45,000,000.

Which is something over \$700 per student, if I have calculated correctly in a hasty calculation.

In 1926 the vocational educational students in agriculture alone in the State of Michigan earned more money while attending school than was expended in that State for all kinds of vocational education by Federal, State, and local communities.

Those are the results which have come from vocational education, mostly in the centers of industry. Now we come to a southern agricultural State:

In the State of Arkansas the trained vocational students produced 230 per cent more cotton per acre than did the farmers of the State. In the State of Georgia the trained vocational students produced more than 100 per cent more cotton per acre than the average yield.

The experiment of vocational education has already been tried and has been found a success. It has been tried most thoroughly, and its results have been most felt in the towns and centers of manufacturing; but I believe the consensus of opinion in this Congress and in the Nation just now is that our greatest need is for a rehabilitation in some way of agriculture. The cry comes everywhere that agriculture is failing; that agriculture is in distress; that agriculture is not paying its actual expenses; and that the rural people are the people who are suffering just now financially, while the rest of the country and almost every other branch of activity is prosperous. I have heard it stated that within from 15 to 20 years our agricultural population would entirely change; that from one-fifteenth to one-twentieth of the whole agricultural population were leaving the farms every year and going to the towns and to the manufacturing centers. Therefore in from 15 to 20 years our agricultural population will change absolutely. Now, it seems to me we can not possibly find a more effective way of doing something worth while for agriculture than to replace that shifting population by a permanent agriculturally trained population; replace it by people who have grown up on the farm, and as they have grown up to manhood and womanhood there they have learned to love the farm and have acquired skill and progressiveness in the matters of farm life.

As I have observed in my own State, as I have gotten information on the Committee on Education, and as I have studied it everywhere, it seems to me the Smith-Hughes work is really doing more as an agricultural relief proposition; it is doing more to really reestablish agriculture, and will in the end mean more as a real agricultural program than any other legislation that has been proposed.

Along with our need of the rehabilitation of agriculture is our need of a permanent and progressive rural population. We have quoted until it has grown old:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

We do not like to say "peasantry," but, rather, a bold, rural population; and we do more for the safety of this country when we are working to a real development of high-grade, happy, satisfied, prosperous rural population—we are doing more for the defense of the country, I will say, than when we are building cruisers and enlarging armament. [Applause.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, having observed the operation of this law during the past 12 years at rather close range and having given it considerable study, I am very pleased to have the opportunity of supporting additional legislation along this line.

I shall vote for the bill because I believe it will assist in educating the boys and girls of the country, and not only educating them but educating them for some specific vocation. They will be better prepared to do their work in rural life than they would be without this legislation. Any help, any encouragement, that we can give to these young Americans should be given. This recognition by the Federal Government will serve as a further stimulus in their efforts to develop the country districts and to make life there more worth the living. [Applause.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee; in the wide range which the discussion of this very important legislation has covered this afternoon, there is one thought which I have not heard advanced. I refer to the relief that will be given to the people throughout the United States, particularly in rural sections, by way of lessening the burden of local taxation. Everyone familiar with the tax situation in the country generally knows that to-day the people in the rural sections are bearing relatively a very heavy burden of the taxes. School and road taxes make up the larger part of this burden. Practically every discussion on farm relief to which I have listened and every speaker who has given any thought to this fascinating theme agree that in the degree we can lessen the burden of local taxation for the support of the necessary institutional life in the country we will make one of the very best contributions toward substantial and permanent farm relief.

It is unnecessary to undertake to add anything to the discussion by way of emphasizing the importance of education for the boys and girls of the open country and particularly that form of education which emphasizes the vocational side. There are thousands of boys and girls who will never be able to take advantage of a college course and yet desire to prepare themselves in every way to be successful farmers and home makers. This bill will make available additional funds to enable the States to extend this form of education much more widely in the rural sections of the country and at the same time relieve the local community where such vocational high schools are established of bearing the whole burden of taxation. Because of the fact that the bill under consideration this afternoon enlarges the opportunities for high school vocational education in all sections of the country and at the same time relieves the local community of bearing the whole burden of operation, I am most heartily in favor of it and I desire to congratulate the committee upon having advanced consideration of the bill to the point of passing it.

When this measure is taken into consideration in connection with the increased appropriation made by the first session of the Seventieth Congress for the encouragement of boys and girls' club work throughout the country, I feel certain that rural life generally, and particularly the boys and girls in the open country are provided the greatest possible encouragement toward securing the training that will better fit them to carry on efficiently in two great fundamental callings of life in the United States, namely, agriculture and home making.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the constitutionality of this bill has been questioned, and I wish to answer that. My time is about up and I shall therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to touch for a moment on the constitutional question. That point has been raised here, and I want to answer it. From remarks made on the floor to-day you would think that the Federal Government had no authority and no right to make appropriations to help the cause of education. The authority for these appropriations is to be found in section 8, Article I of the Federal Constitution, which reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

This clause has given rise to much controversy, but the interpretation given to it by Story in his great work on the Constitution has been followed by Congress in practice since the Government went into operation. As Story observes, the clause should be read as follows:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, in order to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, the common defense and general welfare and the payment of the public debts being the ends for which the power is conferred, and taxation a means for their attainment.

This is the interpretation placed on this clause by Hamilton in 1791, in his report On Manufactures, who stated it as his clear opinion that the phrase "general welfare"—

is as comprehensive as any that could have been used—

And that—

there seems no reason to doubt that whatever concerns the general interests of learning, of agriculture, of manufactures, and of commerce, are within the sphere of the national councils as far as regards an application of money, the only qualification of the generality of the phrase in question which seems to be admissible is this: That the object to which an appropriation of money is to be made must be general and not local, its operation extending in fact, or by possibility, throughout the Union and not being confined to any particular spot.

President Monroe in an elaborate and cogent paper entitled "Views of the President of the United States on the Subject of Material Improvements," submitted with his veto in 1822 of the Cumberland Road bill, took the same view. His attitude is expressed in the following sentence:

My idea is that Congress have an unlimited power to raise money, and that in its appropriation they have a discretionary power, restricted only by the duty to appropriate it to the purposes of common defense and of general, not local, national, not State, benefit.

Since the Civil War there has been no President who denied the right of Congress to raise and appropriate money for purposes of general welfare because such purposes were not within the fields in which Congress is, by other provisions of the Constitution, empowered to legislate.

The appropriations made annually since 1862 for the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Bureau of Mines, and the Bureau of Fisheries can find no justification except under a power to raise and spend money for "the general welfare."

It will be noted, too, that by the Adams Act, the Smith-Lever Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, Congress has made appropriations of large sums of money raised by general taxation for the advancement of education throughout the country.

The same is true of appropriations for the relief of sufferers from disaster in this country, of appropriations for polar expeditions, and for the observations of eclipses of the sun, and for participation in expositions. The relief for sufferers abroad goes even further, as, for example, the appropriation of \$20,000,000 for grain for Russia.

In commenting upon Article I, section 8, to which reference has been made, John Norton Pomeroy, in his work on Constitutional Law, section 275, makes this observation:

What measures, what expenditures, will promote the common defense or general welfare Congress can alone decide, and its decision is final. It is certainly not necessary that any particular expenditure should be spread over the whole country to bring it within the meaning of a defense which shall be common, or a welfare which shall be general. * * * Congress expends vast sums of money in the erection and adornment of a Capitol, in furnishing a library, in the purchase of pictures, statues, and busts, in endowing a scientific institution; but it is not claimed that these disbursements are not made for the general welfare. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the sum of \$500,000, and for each year thereafter, for 11 years a sum exceeding by \$500,000 the sum appropriated for each preceding year, and annually thereafter there is permanently authorized to be appropriated for each year the sum of \$6,000,000. One-half of such sums shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their farm population bears to the total farm population of the United States, exclusive of the insular possessions, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects in such States and Territories. The remaining half of such sums shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their rural population bears to the total rural population of the United States, exclusive of the insular possessions, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors, development and improvement of home economics subjects in such States and Territories.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Page 1, line 6, after the words "June 30," strike out "1929" and insert in lieu thereof "1930."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Page 1, line 7, after the word "for," strike out the word "eleven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "year," insert a period and strike out all of line 9 and line 10 down to and including "\$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 18, page 3, strike out the period and insert a semicolon, and add the following words: "and except that for each dollar of Federal money expended the State shall expend an equal amount for the maintenance of such training, and distribution of teachers of agricultural and home economics subjects shall be had in accordance with the need existing in various localities of the State, and without depriving communities unable to contribute to the expenditure for such purposes, or benefits of such act on account of such failure to contribute."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I addressed myself in general debate. It proposes to change the method of matching only, so as to require matching by the State as a whole, instead of matching by the State or locality or local community. I explained a while ago what to me seemed the evils of the present practice. This does not affect the \$6,000,000 paid out annually under the present law. It has reference only to how the matching will be done under this bill. The average amount appropriated to each State for the first year would be \$10,000. I want to provide, and do provide, that that paltry additional appropriation may be spent by the State board for vocational education according to the needs of the various communities of the State, and without regard to their ability or not to match the Federal fund.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. As far as the first part of the gentleman's amendment is concerned, I do not know that I have any objection, but it seems to me that the last three or four lines of the amendment goes farther than the gentleman really wants to, as it changes the discretionary power which at the present time is lodged in the vocational board of each State. I am not certain but what that would mix up the whole proposition.

Mr. TARVER. I had no purpose of bringing that result about. The latter part of my amendment was added in explanation of the first part. As far as I am concerned I have no objection to modifying the amendment so as to provide only that the appropriations shall be matched by the State.

Mr. SNELL. As I understood the gentleman to say when he conversed with me was that he wanted the funds matched by the State as a whole and not by local communities.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SNELL. And I think he would accomplish that result by striking out the last part of his amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by eliminating all of the amendment after the words "such training" in line 3 of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia will be allowed to modify his amendment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, may we have the modified amendment read as it now stands?

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment: At the end of line 18 strike out the period, page 3, and insert a semicolon, and add the following words: "and except that for each dollar of Federal money expended the State shall expend an equal amount for the maintenance of such training"—

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, if my time has expired, to proceed for an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman understand that everything in his amendment is provided for under existing law?

Mr. TARVER. I do not.

Mr. WRIGHT. Suppose the gentleman's amendment is adopted and some State fails to match the Federal fund? Would not the opportunity be lost?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will remember that in the legislation under which Federal aid is furnished roads the allocation is made on the condition that the amount is matched by the State. That is just the condition I want provided in this bill. I want the matching done by the State, not local communities, so the poorer communities can get some of it. I have not been advised of any State failing to match the Federal appropriation as far as roads are concerned. I called attention a while ago to the fact that the average amount for each State for the first year is only \$10,000 under this bill. There is now being paid out \$6,000,000 each year, and should not we be willing to let this additional \$10,000—the average that will go to each State for the first year—be placed where the need is the greatest in the discretion of the various State boards for vocational education?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am trying to get the effect of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TARVER. I think I got the effect of the gentleman's question.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the State does not match this allocated amount as a State, does not the State lose the amount allocated to it out of the Federal funds?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly; but there is no question but that the gentleman's State and mine will match the small amount provided by the Federal Government under this bill. The only reason States do not do that now is because they realize the local communities will do it, and when they do then necessarily the Federal aid goes to those communities able to do that, and those who are not able to do it and who really need the help the worst get nothing.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is not that a matter that the States ought to settle among themselves, and do not the States know better the needs of the several communities than we in Washington can possibly know?

Mr. TARVER. I do not think we ought to extend to the States an invitation not to match the Federal fund by providing that it may be matched by these various communities, and, therefore, an invitation to follow the practice which has been followed with such disastrous results so far as the needy portions of the States are concerned.

Mr. TILSON. It occurs to me that we are going far enough in matching dollars with the States without going still further and matching with the communities. It seems to me that the States ought to arrange that matter themselves.

Mr. TARVER. That is the position that I take, that the matching ought to be done by the States, and that the local communities should be left out of it. Then the poorer communities could get some of the money.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let us get this matter cleared up. From the question asked by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], the inference might be left in the minds of some that under existing law local communities can not match the Federal Government. As I understand the existing law, not only the States may do it but the local communities in the absence of the State may meet that obligation and can match the Federal fund and get the benefit of the Federal appropriation.

Mr. TARVER. By reason of the conditions I tried to point out to the House, the communities able to do the matching get all the money. I want to provide what the gentleman from Connecticut suggested, that the matching be done by the States, and that the law leave the local communities out of it entirely, and then let the State boards exercise their discretion as to where the money should go.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under existing law the Federal national board can not deal directly with the local communities in allocating this fund. They have to deal through the States' educational authorities.

Mr. TARVER. They deal through the State boards for vocational education.

Mr. DENISON. Is not the fundamental principle of the whole legislation to try to induce the States as States to go into this vocational education?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; and especially to help the helpless and not those who do not need help.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] was considered by the committee very carefully. It is not the purpose of this legislation to step in and try to dictate to the States what ought to be done in the matter, and I think this amendment ought to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 10, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the committee will now rise and report the bill back to the House.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 1731) to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories, and reported the same back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered on the amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. REED of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS FEBRUARY 22, 1929

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 22, 1929, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] may have one hour in which to address the House on the life and character of George Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that on February 22, 1929, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] may proceed for one hour on the subject of George Washington. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object, but I rise to ask whether it is the purpose to follow the usual program on that day and have Washington's Farewell Address read to the House?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know that there has been any program suggested, but there is nothing to interfere with having that done later, if the Members of the House desire it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have three legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HALL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ardently favor the passage of S. 1731 as an aid to vocational training. Looking back over the past fifty-odd years I can not but be impressed with the importance, the dignity, and sterling worth of a measure whose purpose it is to give to the youth of our Nation the advantages of the trained hand as well as the trained mind. At no time in the history of the world was there greater call for the people of the world to have a revival of devotion to duty through efficient and painstaking toil.

Work is not a curse, as some seem to think. It is God's medium of happiness. To have a job, to do that job well, is the secret of success and happiness; and it does not make much

difference what the job is. The founders of the Republic were the hardest working people of history. They thus created within a century a nation which leads the world in government, science, art, mechanics, and production for human needs. Their life and example proves the theory that genius is as closely allied to perspiration as to inspiration.

The added charm that American ideals have given to human industry is illustrated in the progress of the Nation as the founders of the Republic toiled to clear the forests and to build homes and schools and churches and factories; and as they toiled they prayed, and thus laid wide and deep the foundations of a model human government. They applied their skill of mind and heart and brain to the invention and building of machines, to the harnessing of the forces of nature for use in the service of mankind, making it easier to acquire the necessities and more possible to enjoy the luxuries of life than has ever before been known in any land in any age.

It is a serious duty that now devolves upon the present generation following such a noble history of the example of our forefathers. Are we assuming as wholesome and as normal an attitude toward plain, honest work as characterized the activities of those who showed us the way? Their precepts and our blessed heritage of a desire and ability to efficiently toil has been unequaled in the annals of the human race.

The fourth commandment of the Decalogue is that "Six days shalt thou labor." This was not for our punishment. It was for our good. In recent years, however, there has evidently been too much of a disposition to substitute speculation, commercial gambling, cleverness, shrewdness, and scheming for clean, straight, constructive achievement through the process of honest individual effort and stable organized endeavor.

Christ in this twelfth year said to his mother: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Most of the great men of this country have been sons of widowed mothers. It is extremely probable that much of their greatness is due to the fact that in their early life they were required to be "about their father's business," in order to provide for themselves, for their mother and her family and thereby learning the lessons of responsibility, judgment, and decision to be acquired only by useful work. It frequently becomes too tempting to concentrate on "How much can we get?" instead of "How well can we serve." As sure as night follows day, ultimately, in the great plan of Divine Providence, the law of compensation will work as does the law of gravitation. "He profits most who serves best."

Out of the vortex of destruction and waste of the great war America has again set her face toward the dawn; the dawn of a brighter and a better civilization. To attain this there must come a renewed dedication to personal industry and by precept and example carry on the good work of the fathers. It should be the supreme purpose of every home and school and church, and on every farm and in every kind of business to make work more congenial, more interesting, more equitable, more productive, more attractive. America is calling to-day for more men and women to watch, to stand fast, to be strong, to keep the faith of the fathers, and to work.

The whole plan of creation and existence contemplates the necessity and joy of work. One of the grandest old songs ever set to music is "Work, for the night is coming."

It is not given to all of us to serve our country in a military way. We can not all die for our country, but we can do that thing which now and here confronts us, we can all live for our country, obey its laws, and work for its continued progress. In doing this we must be prepared and we must see to it that future generations are prepared. Preparation is in teaching the mind and hand how to work.

The old idea of human progress was that only by slow and almost imperceptible steps can civilization evolve to its highest forms or the inherent evils of human society overcome. To-day science has so revolutionized most of our early concepts that we find many of the things we have believed in unable to bear the clear light of critical analysis.

The early history of our country demanded the public school. To-day the times demand another equally important step to accelerate the evolution of social progress, to prevent decadence, and to keep step with the rapid strides of the mechanical arts.

The people need and demand a broader, deeper, more complete education, expressed in terms of present-day conditions and made universal just as was the public school. Benjamin Franklin's father took his boy out walking to observe various tradesmen at work in order to learn the youth's particular bent or inclination. All parents do not exercise the same wise forethought, but vocational guidance is now becoming recognized as a legitimate and important function of the public school.

It is said that the most dangerous point in the lives of children in the elementary school is the moment at which they leave it. Unless children are properly directed at this turning point in their lives, the knowledge and discipline acquired at school may be lost and they may become eventually unfit either for employment or for further education.

Boys and girls on leaving school are thrust into industry in great numbers, and are employed merely as process workers and not as apprentices. Too many boys fall into the casual employments or blind-alley jobs that drive them into the ranks of the unskilled, and later they drift along as vocational tramps. New demands are therefore made for solving the problem of vocational education.

In our colleges, seminaries, and universities, where pure science should have its best expression, we too often find instead the most persistent adherence to the old and unscientific methods of memory cramming, with total neglect of mind and hand training. This system is in direct antagonism with the teaching of Spencer, that a more scientific and practical education not only better fits for complete living but for higher attainments and the enjoyment of all that is ethical and aesthetic in life.

It is to meet this emergency in our educational system that the vocational school has come into existence. The remark is often made that our social progress does not keep pace with our mechanical progress. To prepare for the higher civilization that is surely coming, the first and most important step is to introduce a general system of industrial and vocational education which, as a noted expert declares, "produces a new and superior order of people."

If our civilization is to reach its highest attainment, we must come to see that no aim or object of social desire is so great as the best possible development and training of the average citizenship; and the present haste and waste of rushing immature children from the schools into bread-winning life, to become, like the machines they operate in factory and shop, mere automatons, is most harmful and is ultimately destructive of national permanence.

Pupils who enter a vocational school at 14 to 16 years of age can not begin life in any possible manner so hopefully, so advantageously, as through a course that from its very nature draws out and develops the thinking powers and applies the thinking to practical work with the hands. The whole effort of working to create the needs of physical life, aside from its healthful, hygienic value, is admirably adapted to develop the ability to reason from cause to effect and thus strengthen the logical powers.

Man is essentially a creator, and the development of his creative faculties as a necessary part of his education is an economic necessity. It is but little use to develop the receptive powers of the brain without at the same time and as a necessary reflex action developing the active and formative powers of the hand.

Skilled labor is a part of morality and religion and the culture of the mechanical productive faculties a portion of spiritual growth. Attempts at the elevation of the race merely by storing the mind with facts and literary concepts while neglecting to develop the creative powers of the brain and the dexterity of the hand have been discredited. The pathway of all race progress with each individual of the race is identified first by the cultivation of the hand to do, then of the brain to remember how and why.

To express one's self and to develop individuality by the creative skill of the hands is a foundation principle of progress, and we can best develop the latent faculties of the race by adhering to this philosophy. Vocational training is built upon this broad and secure foundation and is allied with all that is best in the constructive ideals of our social and industrial life.

I am in favor of the provisions of the bill. I shall vote for it, and I hope it will pass.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to this bill is based solely upon the ground that it is another Federal-aid measure, and Congress, in my opinion, has no authority to vote public funds for such purpose.

I do not question the advisability of educating children in the rural district, but it should be left to the several States, and the Government should not be asked to make any contributions for such a purpose.

No one realizes the value of education better than I do. I want to see all children, regardless of where they reside, receive a proper education.

Being opposed to all Federal-aid measures I intend to be consistent and vote against this appropriation.

The original bill which the chairman of the Committee on Rules tells us will be amended by the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Education provided for a continuing appropriation of \$6,000,000 annually. This continuing feature will be eliminated. I mention this because it will be shown that the purpose is not only to stimulate the States to appropriate money for vocational education, but as the original bill provided an annual appropriation of \$6,000,000 it is clear the committee decided that it should go on for all time. We were told to-day this amendment is entirely satisfactory to the proponents of the proposition. They are willing to take anything they can get.

The boys and girls on the farms are entitled to an education. My State sees to it that they receive one, and it does not require any stimulating from the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] has challenged any Member of the House to point out to him any clause in the Constitution that justifies the passage of this bill or extends authority to the Congress to enact such legislation. When this challenge was made I noticed on the floor the presence of a number of Members well qualified on constitutional questions but there was no reply to the gentleman from Virginia's challenge. The people seem to feel they are getting something for nothing in Federal-aid measures. The truth of the matter is the money allocated to the States for such projects is taken from the States in the form of taxes. If the Congress will discontinue these Federal-aid projects then there might be an opportunity to pass a substantial tax reduction bill.

Meritorious projects now stimulated by Federal aid will be carried on by progressive States when the Federal aid is discontinued.

Mrs. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, during my services as a Member of this body, one truth has been brought forcibly to my attention. Whenever legislation which vitally affects the welfare of the youth of our country is presented to the House, the sentiment is unanimously in favor of that legislation, which is just as it should be.

There has never been a time within the memory of living man when the sentiment favoring the hope of our land, the youth of to-day, is as direct, as emphatic, and all prevailing than at the present time.

The welfare and development of those living in the rural sections is of paramount importance and should claim our immediate attention and consideration. The life of our Nation depends largely upon the happiness and contentment, the education and development, the furtherance of the interests of the masses of nature's noblemen, the farmers of this great country.

The bill now under consideration, which carries an additional fund for further development of vocational education in the several States, is a work which it has been my privilege to personally see effectively carried forward in my own State of Kentucky.

I represent a rural and mining section, and we have been confronted with the distressing problem of finding productive farm work for our boys and girls who have been leaving the rural sections seeking other fields for wider opportunity, and there has been a widespread need for vocational aid of this character to conserve and develop the natural resources of the farms, thereby promoting productive agriculture as well as preventing waste of human labor.

I feel this aid, which was initiated in 1917, has obtained the entire confidence in those States where it has been in operation; and when we are confronted with the data that the States are now spending for vocational education \$2.65 for each dollar of Federal funds used, we can in part realize the great value this Federal aid is to the States availing themselves of this opportunity. The benefits to the communities thus aided has been of inestimable value.

As I understand it, one of the aims of this great educational work is to bring the school back into line with the farm in a helpful, practical way, and to train the farmers to utilize many new improvements in farming implements and machinery, such as tractors, and so forth, at the same time to teach them to grow and market crops and livestock.

One of the greatest benefits to be derived from the work as carried forward in vocational education is the aid to the home makers. The home is the altar of national love and national service and should be the center but not the boundary of our obligations.

The welfare of this country and the good of its people, all gravitate around the home maker, and I sincerely feel that in the upbuilding and perfecting of the duties which devolve around the housewife, the mother, at the helm, with the spokes of the wheel as typifying the boys and girls in the home, is most surely safeguarded, furthered, and promoted by the work as carried forward under the provisions of this bill.

With all the facts which have been so ably presented by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education, Mr. REED of New York, and other Members of the House, the

Member from the tenth congressional district of Kentucky earnestly hopes that this bill, which is of immeasurable value to the farms, the boys and girls, and last but not least to the homes in the rural sections, and which gives to them the just and fair recognition to which they are entitled, be given the entire support and approval of the House. Hold fast to that which is good.

After all is said and done in life and living, in industry and toil, in all that affects the welfare of men, women, and children, all States are alike hurt and helped by the same causes.

The work as carried forward under the Smith-Hughes bill has been of great value to agriculture and the service to the communities tremendously important.

The pending measure, while it does not involve a large expenditure by the Federal Government, will give a fair and equitable allotment to the several States and will greatly stimulate the rural communities.

Go with me back to the early days and see the masses of the world's workers, the deliver in the coal mine on his side crawling to his dark task with no room to stand, see the plodding farmer with his hoe at noonday in the burning sun, see the countless men and women working unceasingly amid the crowded conditions of the factories, all a vast army struggling for existence, then visualize the present day with all its improved methods devised to aid the working classes, and the measures passed by Congress to promote the onward march of civilization. I believe that one of the greatest factors which brought about the sweeping and deserved popular vote received by Herbert Hoover as President of the United States was the recognition by the home makers of this country that he understood their problems and would promote all constructive legislation which would directly and indirectly aid and further their interests.

Home, fireside, and kitchen know the great benefits to be derived from this measure. The housewife knows that a plan, wise and practical, is helping to transmit her work to beneficial results. The hour of battle to win in every avenue of human achievement is at hand. In the midst of the world's fiercest competition we must go forward or we are lost.

To-day we are striving to make the paths of our children and our children's children easier by giving them aid in vocational education, so that those who come after us may move onward, ever forward, and thus pass on into the promised land of turning wheel and glowing forge, of happy homes and smiling fields, where God shall bless them with peace and plenty.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the basic industry of the Nation. It is the foundation of all wealth, the bulwark of all material progress. It buttresses and supports every line of useful human endeavor. While the products of the toil of others add to the comforts and conveniences of life, man could live without them; but the fruits of the farmer's toil of hand and brain are absolutely essential to human existence. In other days the farmer was the leader in the business and political affairs of the country; but in recent years he has been compelled to wage a losing battle, while others have outstripped him.

The clamor of the market place and the din and roar of whirling wheels and spindles in our great industrial centers have so stifled his voice that it is now heard but feebly, if at all. He no longer enjoys the God-given right of fighting for prosperity and success upon a basis of economic equality with other industries. He neither has anything to say about the price which he receives for his raw materials, nor has he any voice in determining what he shall pay for the products out of which his raw materials are finished. He is denied a just share of the wealth which he has created. Through an ingenious manipulation of the tariff and through other means fostered by governmental favoritism, he has seen others wax fat with prosperity, while profits have slipped from his hands and the accumulations of years of honest toil have rapidly faded away. Since 1920 the values of farm lands and of farm products have sustained the appalling shrinkage of more than \$30,000,000,000. In the last 15 years the farmer has seen his taxes increase more than 150 per cent, while to-day he is receiving an increase of only 30 per cent above what his crops brought to him 15 years ago. In that period commodities bought by the farmer for use in production, plus wages paid to hired labor, have increased more than 50 per cent, and commodities bought by him for the maintenance of his family have increased 60 per cent in price. The fortitude and the patience with which the farmers of the country have borne their burdens are most remarkable and inspiring, and I am happy to know that, notwithstanding his misfortunes, the love of the farm still abides in the farmer's heart.

The political party which has been in complete control of all branches of the Government for the last eight years, and which will have control of the executive agencies of the Nation for the next four years and of the legislative branch for the next two years, is under solemn pledge "to the development and enactment of measures which will place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries to insure its prosperity and success."

I hope time may demonstrate that this solemn pledge made to the electorate was not made for the purpose of catching votes, but that it was made with the determination to live up to it in every respect. I am a Democrat, representing a great constituency composed largely of Democrats, but I want to see the Republican Party redeem this pledge within the very near future, and I shall be glad to join with my Republican friends in Congress in any proper effort to relieve the widespread distress from which the agricultural interests are now suffering.

But for the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, and other measures enacted under the Democratic administration then in power, hundreds of thousands of young men now on farms, furnishing the raw materials which give life and prosperity to our industrial centers, would have been lured away from the farm to compete with labor in our cities. While these young men, who have attended vocational schools and have remained upon the farm, have not received the material reward to which they were entitled, they have been impressed with the dignity and importance of their avocation, and dwellers in cities have enjoyed increased benefits.

The bill now under consideration, providing for additional appropriations for the teaching of agriculture and home economics to the boys and girls of the rural sections of our country, will not relieve the distressing conditions now prevailing in agriculture, but it is a step in the right direction. It is a recognition of the importance of training young men and young women to cope with the intricate and complex problems which have become so acute and pressing to all who are engaged in the pursuit of agriculture. In traveling through the district which I have the honor to represent I have witnessed a marvelous transformation in school and community activities since vocational education has been taught in our rural schools.

I attended a number of school fairs held in my district last fall, and was delighted to find the boys and girls deeply interested in all those things which add to the comfort, convenience, and happiness of home life on the farm. At these school fairs there were exhibited the better grades of livestock, poultry, fruits, vegetables, grains, and other farm products, as well as the handiwork of the girls, and these fairs compared favorably with the county fairs of previous years. The intelligent and friendly rivalry engaged in by the different schools must have a beneficial influence on the communities in which they were held. This awakened interest in agriculture not only means that we shall have better crops and better livestock in the future but also that the farmer shall again assume his rightful place in the leadership of the business, political, and social affairs of our country. These vocational schools have also benefited those who, by reason of age, have been unable to attend them, for the enthusiasm of the boys and girls has been carried to their parents, creating a wholesome influence in community life.

In Kentucky, while we are considering this bill, honor is being paid to the 10 leading farmers of that great Commonwealth. One of these so-called "master farmers" to whom our State is paying tribute hails from the county in which I live, and I feel assured that the great work which he has done on the farm has been inspired largely by the teaching of vocational education in the community in which he lives. I know of no greater honor that could have befallen Mr. M. D. Harrison than to have been chosen as one of the 10 "master farmers" of the State of Kentucky, and I rejoice that this distinction has been bestowed upon one of the worthy citizens of my district.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill, because I believe its enactment into law will speed the coming of the day when the boys and the girls on the farm will have the same opportunities for happiness and prosperity which are enjoyed by the boys and girls in our great cities.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, The principle involved in the Reed-Menges bill is no departure. It is simply a measure to provide for an increase of the contribution of the Federal Government to high schools for the teaching of agriculture and home economics. It involves the same principle identically as the Smith-Hughes Act. Hundreds of schools have been functioning under this law for several years. The constitutionality of the Smith-Hughes Act has never been tested in the courts. The principle involved is also much the same as that of all measures providing Federal aid to public roads. The general welfare

clause of the Constitution applies to the case and covers this proposed legislation completely.

When the American people adopted the Constitution with the words "promote the general welfare" in its preamble they meant in effect that the Congress of the United States would have the right to legislate on matters tending to "promote the general welfare." No one can dispute the fact that any program tending toward education and culture of the people promotes the general welfare.

Educators and school authorities of my great State of Ohio have the same reverence and respect of the Constitution as citizens of other States. But there is another document of great importance and similar significance to which they frequently look as a justification of their programs for furthering education. The Ordinance of 1787, which antedates the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, contains language of great significance. This document in bold, clear English says:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The Ordinance of 1787 was the constitution for the Northwest Territory. From this territory has been carved five great Commonwealths, of which Ohio is not the least illustrious. Not only does this immortal document recognize education along with religion and morality as the very corner stone of a substantial national existence, but pledges itself and the governmental agencies established by virtue of it to a program of furtherance of the means of education. The pioneers who settled the great Northwest Territory insisted that the church and the school should keep company with the advance guard of growth and progress. In keeping with this spirit there was established at Athens, in my congressional district, the first college west of the Allegheny Mountains. This college has operated with great credit to a long list of illustrious instructors and a longer list of equally illustrious alumni. This college is now known as Ohio University and is a living monument to the spirit of the sturdy pioneer and a great credit to a magnificent Commonwealth.

The spirit that actuated the Ordinance of 1787 and the spirit that established Athens College is the same spirit that causes the legislators of Ohio, year after year, to appropriate large sums of money to those sections of the State where land is poor and cheap and where the tax revenues are not sufficient to maintain adequate school facilities. In Ohio the policy is "to educate the children where they live and to tax wealth where it is found." Truly, in Ohio we maintain that "the means of education are necessary to good government."

It is little wonder, then, that the educators and school authorities of Ohio were ready to cooperate with the program of education in agriculture and rural economics as provided in the Smith-Hughes Act. Encouraged by the spirit of these advance agents of child welfare in Ohio I am proud to lend my best assistance to the passing of the Reed-Menges bill.

My State has made wonderful progress in vocational education under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act. Last year there were 196 high-school departments of vocational agriculture in Ohio. These departments were distributed over 77 counties of the State. In addition to the 4-year courses for high-school students, part-time and evening courses were offered to out-of-school young men and adult farmers. Nearly 10,000 students were enrolled in our various agricultural courses during the year. An important part of the vocational agriculture program is the home-project work. High-school boys produced over \$300,000 worth of products from their projects during the year.

The State program in vocational home economics has been equally effective. Nearly 11,000 students were enrolled in vocational home economics courses in Ohio during the past year. Additional schools in my district are deprived of these vocational courses because of lack of funds. This bill will provide some of these additional funds. In my State more than 97 per cent of the Smith-Hughes money is used for the direct support of teachers in local communities. All of the money appropriated under this bill will be used for the establishment of new departments of vocational agriculture and home economics in my State and district. I believe in legislation which will give help to my constituents right out in the home communities where they live, and I support it most loyally.

My district has 10 high-school vocational agricultural departments which have functioned very effectively. One of these vocational agriculture instructors in my district has conducted an evening course for 14 adult farmers of his community which has continued for nearly two years. Evening classes are held once each week. These farmers carry out on their home farms the practices which they discuss in class.

I know of one instance in one of my counties where the teacher of one of these agriculture schools contributed many times more to the financial benefit of the farmers in that community than his salary amounted to. In his spare time he devised a cooperative plan whereby the growers of small vegetables and berries in that community could market their crop cooperatively. Instead of peddling their crops in competition with each other in a market that was always glutted they sent their products away to larger and higher markets in carload lots at a much better price and at a saving of the labor of hauling off and peddling. This also left a better market to those who were not able to enter the cooperation by reason of location or lack of equipment. This is an instance of practical benefit to the parents and the community. Likewise it is an illustration of where the school is brought closer in contact to the patrons. The best results in any line of education are accomplished when there is a healthy cooperation between the school and the home.

THE LATE HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request on the part of the Alabama delegation in Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution by that delegation in reference to the life, character, and public services of the late Senator Underwood, of that State, be incorporated in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution is as follows:

The delegation from Alabama in the House of Representatives has learned of the death of Senator Oscar W. Underwood with profound regret and genuine personal sorrow. We feel that it may be said in all candor that no American of the present generation has contributed more richly than he to the annals of the Nation.

Intrusted as he was with many positions of eminence and responsibility, he brought to the discharge of his public duties such high order of courage and intellectual capacity as to win and deserve the admiration and affection of his associates as well as the people of the entire country.

For 20 years as a Representative in Congress and 12 years as a Senator from Alabama, he rendered conspicuous and enduring service; his ability and character having won for him the official leadership of his party in both branches of Congress.

In his field of international relations he likewise achieved signal distinction, having been a member of the Washington Disarmament Conference and the sixth International Conference of American States at Habana in 1928.

At two national conventions of the Democratic Party he was a formidable contender for the presidential nomination.

In addition to being attracted by his intellectual endowments, the friends of Senator Underwood loved him for his personal charm, for his genial comradeship, and for unwavering candor and intellectual courage.

A great son of Alabama has gone to his reward. We reverently cherish his memory and honor his achievements. The historian will record the name of Oscar W. Underwood as one of the great Americans.

TO AMEND SECTION 321 OF THE PENAL CODE

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7200) passed by the Senate, a bill to amend section 321 of the Penal Code, and to agree to the Senate amendment and pass the bill.

THE SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 7200) to amend section 321 of the Penal Code.

The Senate amendment was read.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this?

THE SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment which has been just read.

Mr. BEGG. Has the gentleman obtained permission to take it from the Speaker's table as yet?

THE SPEAKER. The question is, Is there objection? The Senate amendment has been read.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I recall this is a bill of the Judiciary Committee of the House, and I am just wondering if the gentleman who called up the matter had consulted the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House as to whether this amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. In the absence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] who is sick, I consulted the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] who has seen most of

the members of the committee as nearly as he could and found no objection to the amendment. It is acceptable to the introducer, who was myself. It simply extends to the Territory the measure of local self-government that is now in fact in the possession of Porto Rico and the Philippines, and I hope very much there will be no objection.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have not had an opportunity to compare the Senate amendment with the original House bill, but I think the House bill was entirely stricken out and a new Senate bill inserted, but I think under the circumstances the gentleman may well let the matter go over.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. If the gentleman will reserve that for a moment, the bill passed by the Senate is substantially the same as the bill passed by the House, except it has been checked over by the legislative drafting clerks, which was not done in the preparation of mine.

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request for the time being.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I will withdraw the request.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would like to look into the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii withdraws his request.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 1142. An act amending the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. L. p. 868), and other acts relating to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James E. Jenkins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2192. An act for the relief of Lemuel Simpson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3770. An act authorizing the Federal Power Commission to issue permits and licenses on Fort Apache and White Mountain Indian Reservations, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 4125. An act to amend chapter 15 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4691. An act to extend the provisions 18a of an act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), to certain lands in Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 5093. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution restricting the Federal Power Commission from issuing or approving any permits or licenses affecting the Colorado River or any of its tributaries, except the Gila River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 29, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, January 29, 1929, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the Foreign Service buildings act, 1926, as amended (H. R. 15735).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

(10 a. m.)

Directing the Comptroller General of the United States to readjust the account between the city of Baltimore and the United States (H. J. Res. 308).

To confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact (H. R. 15520).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider general legislation.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the establishment of a national hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and the construction of a building therefor (S. 1710).

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10 a. m.)

Continuing the powers and authority of the Federal Radio Commission under the radio act of 1927 (H. R. 15430).

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m. and 2 p. m.)

Tariff hearings as follows:

SCHEDULES

Spirits, wines, and other beverages, January 29.

Cotton manufactures, January 30, 31, February 1.

Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of, February 4, 5.

Wool and manufactures of, February 6.

Silk and silk goods, February 11, 12.

Papers and books, February 13, 14.

Sundries, February 15, 18, 19.

Free list, February 20, 21, 22.

Administrative and miscellaneous, February 25.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

776. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1930, in the sum of \$100,000 to enable the Chief Executive to continue the litigation to cancel certain leases of oil lands and incidental contracts, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 534); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

777. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1928, \$1,000, and supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1929, \$18,325,000; in all, \$18,326,000; also a draft of proposed legislation affecting the use of an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 533); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, \$462,500, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, \$1,414,820, to provide additional amounts for personal services (H. Doc. No. 532); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

779. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, for the Navy Department, amounting to \$450,000 (H. Doc. No. 535); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, for the Navy Department, amounting in all to \$4,050,000 (H. Doc. No. 563); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

781. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill to establish a naval airship base in one of the Pacific coast States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

782. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates by the Bureau of the Budget of appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, amounting to \$45,668.50 (H. Doc. No. 537); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

783. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates by the Bureau of the Budget of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, amounting to \$174,32, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, amounting to \$272,434 (H. Doc. No. 538); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HALE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10664. A bill for the relief of the State of Maine; without amendment

(Rept. No. 2249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 15861. A bill to amend section 5 of an act approved March 2, 1919, known as the war minerals act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8146. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a hard-surfaced road across Fort Sill (Okla.) Military Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 16082. A bill to authorize the disposition of unplatted portions of Government town sites on irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1271. An act to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory-bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for the adequate protection of such birds; and by providing funds for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance, and improvement, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5933. A bill for the relief of Mabel L. Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 2245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10200. A bill for the relief of Carrie McIntyre; with amendment (Rept. No. 2246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11383. A bill for the relief of Angenora Hines; without amendment (Rept. No. 2247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LOWREY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 16535. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to execute a satisfaction of a certain mortgage given by the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co. to the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 2248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7174. A bill granting compensation to William T. Ring; with amendment (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. LANGLEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 15197. A bill for the relief of Alma Rawson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8519. A bill for the relief of A. N. Worstell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10817. A bill to provide for suit against the United States by the Merrill Engineering Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Committee on Claims. H. R. 14583. A bill for the relief of A. Brizard (Inc.); with amendment (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 14738. A bill for the relief of the Marshall State Bank; with amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 15161. A bill for the relief of Jessie L. Kinsey; without amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUDSPETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 15914. A bill for the relief of John T. Painter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 16219. A bill for the relief of the Federal Construction Co. (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 2259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 16342. A bill for the relief of Clyde H. Tavenner; without amendment (Rept. No. 2260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER: Committee on Claims. S. 1766. An act for the relief of R. H. King; without amendment (Rept. No. 2261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5950. A bill for the relief of Alice Sarrazin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 16640) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mound City, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 16641) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Washington, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 16642) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chattanooga and the county of Hamilton, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tennessee River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, opposite or near Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 16643) to amend and supplement an act entitled "An act to amend the salary rates contained in the compensation schedules of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled 'An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services,' approved May 28, 1928, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 16644) to create a national university at the seat of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 16645) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON (by request): A bill (H. R. 16646) to prohibit the importation and interstate transportation of films or pictorial representation of certain crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 16647) authorizing an investigation to determine the best methods and means of utilizing the waters of the Pecos River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 16648) to amend an act to authorize construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., approved March 10, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16649) to provide a public terminal aviation field at Governors Island, N. Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 16650) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field service," approved March 4, 1923; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 16651) to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 16652) to enlarge the Army and Navy General Hospital at Hot Springs National Park, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 16653) relating to the separation of employees from the classified civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 16654) to adjust the salaries of employees in the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LEAVITT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 16655) to authorize the survey of certain land claimed by the Zuni Pueblo Indians, New Mexico, and the issuance of patent therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 16656) providing for retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service, equivalent to retired pay granted to members of the

Coast Guard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16657) to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 16658) to amend sections 116, 118, and 126 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to divide the eighth judicial circuit of the United States, and to create a tenth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 16659) to authorize an appropriation to pay one-half the cost of a bridge on the Cheyenne River in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16660) to authorize an appropriation to pay one-half of the cost of a bridge on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation in South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 16661) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the paving of the Federal strip known as International Street adjacent to Nogales, Ariz.," approved May 16, 1928; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 16662) to authorize appropriations for buildings, sites, and other facilities for the free Public Library of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 16663) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to detail officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist the Governments of the Latin-American Republics in military and naval matters," approved May 19, 1926; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 16664) regarding hours of labor of certain watchmen and building guards in the "custodial service"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 16665) authorizing an appropriation to enable the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain plans approved by said commission; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 391) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 392) to provide for the erection on Government land of a permanent building for the use of the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 300) for the consideration of H. R. 16034, to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the District Court of the United States for the middle district of Pennsylvania, and S. 1965, to provide for an additional judge in the northern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of the State of Pennsylvania, extending to the Federal Government an invitation to consider the Blue Ridge Mountain section of Pennsylvania in any action taken to select a site for a summer White House; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Memorial from the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, indorsing and urging the passage of the cruiser bill now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: Memorial adopted by the Michigan State Senate, urging immediate and helpful action by Congress for the beet-sugar industry of the United States by increasing the import duty on raw sugar to 3 cents and by restricting the duty-free importation of cane sugar from the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial adopted by the Michigan State Senate, indorsing the appropriation of funds to immediately add 300 beds to the United States veterans' hospital at Camp Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial from the Michigan State Senate, urging increase in the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial from the Michigan State Senate, urging additional beds for the United States veterans' hospital at Camp Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 16666) for the relief of Katherine Elizabeth Kerrigan Callaghan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 16667) granting a pension to Samuel Round; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 16668) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wirth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 16669) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Rickabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 16670) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the legal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16671) granting an increase of pension to Rocelia Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 16672) granting a pension to Amelia Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16673) granting a pension to Mary A. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16674) granting a pension to Emma Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16675) granting a pension to Mary A. Ueberroth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16676) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Shumway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 16677) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 16678) granting a pension to Frank W. Gabriel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 16679) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 16680) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 16681) granting a pension to Katherine Farris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 16682) for the relief of the heirs of Warren C. Vesta; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 16683) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Rivenour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORMAN: A bill (H. R. 16684) granting a pension to Mary C. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 16685) for the relief of Robert J. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 16686) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Keating; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 16687) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Kabosky; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 16688) granting an increase of pension to Emily A. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 16689) granting an increase of pension to Irene P. Mentzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16690) granting an increase of pension to Ella A. Claypoole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 16691) to authorize the Secretary of War to settle the claims of the owners of the French steamships *P. L. M. 4* and *P. L. M. 7* for damages sustained as the result of collisions between such vessels and the U. S. S. *Henderson* and *Lake Charlotte*, and to settle the claim of the United States against the owners of the French steamship *P. L. M. 7* for damages sustained by the U. S. S. *Pennsylvanian* in a collision with the *P. L. M. 7*; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 16692) granting a pension to Anna E. Antle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 16693) granting a pension to William A. Lay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Resolution (H. Res. 301) for the payment of additional compensation to Bingham W. Mathias, clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8412. Petition of Chicot Trust Co., Lake Village, Ark., to pass a bill that will establish a moratorium for the payment of drainage bonds until such time as agriculture has recovered from its depressed condition; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8413. By Mr. BRIGGS: Letter from R. Lee Kempner, vice president United States National Bank of Galveston, Tex., indorsing House bill 16347, Seventieth Congress, second session, proposing to amend the bankruptcy law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8414. By Mr. CARLEY: Petition of Thomas J. Howard, protesting against amendment of Senate bill 1781, which would include coastwise vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8415. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of members of the Proctor Forum, of Proctor, Minn., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8416. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition protesting against any change in the present tariff on hides and leathers used in the manufacture of shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8417. By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution of the chamber of commerce of Sebawaing, Mich., urging adequate tariff on sugar and farm products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8418. By Mr. ESLICK: Petition of Rev. A. L. Wheatly and others, of Lawrenceburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8419. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Boundary County, that a law be enacted to establish a moratorium for the payment of drainage bonds; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8420. Also, petition of citizens of Bonners Ferry, Boundary County, Idaho, for enactment of a law that will establish a moratorium for the payment of drainage bonds until such time as agriculture has recovered from its depressed condition, the legislation to be effective to provide for Government loans without interest to drainage districts already organized for the purpose of meeting their annual payments on drainage bonds; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8421. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the National United Committee for Law Enforcement, urging certain changes in the emergency prohibition appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8422. Also, petition of the Ohio Broadcasters' Association, urging amendment of the Federal radio law so as to provide for the distribution of broadcasting facilities equitably in accordance with the population of the States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8423. Also, petition of the J. J. Johnson Camp, Spanish-American War Veterans, Okemah, Okla., urging support of legislation to increase the pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

8424. Also, petition of the Maternity Center Association, New York City, urging support of the Newton bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8425. Also, petition of the College of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Memphis, Tenn., urging the necessity of the scrupulous observance of the prohibition law by the individual citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8426. Also, petition of the Perseverance Social Benefit Association and Perseverance Social Club (Inc.), of Buffalo, N. Y., and unanimously indorsed by Italian-American Civil Liberties Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against fascist propaganda in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8427. Also, petition of the National Livestock and Meat Board, urging an increase in the tariff rates on meat and meat animals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8428. Also, petition of Oklahoma State Farmers' Union, comprising national legislative program of that organization; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8429. Also, petition of the Comitia Minora of the Medical Society of the County of New York, in opposition to the Newton bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8430. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Sebawaing, Mich., urging protection for domestic sugar and farm products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8431. By Mr. KING: Petition of citizens of the community of Canton, Ill., petitioning Congress to pass a bill that will establish a moratorium for the payment of drainage bonds until such time as agriculture has recovered from its depressed condition, the legislation to be effective to provide for Government loans without interest to drainage districts already organized, for the

purpose of meeting their annual payments on drainage bonds; petition submitted by S. E. Gustine, for the East Liverpool drainage and levee district, Canton, Ill.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8432. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Ohio Broadcasters' Association, favoring certain amendments to the Federal radio act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8433. Also, petition of Thomas J. Howard and John Tracy, of New York City, opposing amendments to Senate bill 1781, to include coastwise vessels in its application; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8434. Also, petition of the Neptune Line (Inc.), opposing amendments to Senate bill 1781, to include coastwise vessels in its application; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

8435. Also, petition of James H. Cruikshank, of New York City, favoring the passage of the Norbeck bird conservation bill (S. 1271); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8436. Also, petition of Albert S. Bard, of New York City, favoring the passage of the Norbeck bird conservation bill (S. 1271); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8437. By Mr. WELCH of California: Memorial of Danner & Baker (Inc.), dealers in china and satsuma, 1366 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against proposed increased tariff on undecorated white chinaware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8438. Also, memorial of Pacific American Steamship Association and Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast, protesting against placing a tariff of 2 cents per pound on oil cake, oil-cake meals, and soy beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8439. Also, memorial of Coalinga Chamber of Commerce, Coalinga, Calif., protesting against present tariff on crude oil and advocating increased tariff on this commodity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8440. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Latrobe Branch No. 1773, Association of Postal Clerks, and Latrobe Branch No. 772, National Association of Letter Carriers; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

TUESDAY, January 29, 1929

(Legislative day of Monday, January 28, 1929)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1731) to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Frederic A. Delano and Irwin B. Laughlin as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1929.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1364. An act for the relief of R. Wilson Selby;

S. 1633. An act for the relief of Edward A. Blair;

S. 2362. An act to authorize the payment to Robert Toquothty of royalties arising from an oil and gas well in the bed of Red River, Okla.;

S. 2989. An act for the relief of John B. Moss;

S. 3327. An act for the relief of Robert B. Murphy;

S. 3741. An act for the relief of S. L. Roberts;

S. 4454. An act for the relief of Jess T. Fears; and

S. 4927. An act for the relief of Peter Shapp.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRUISERS

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to offer for printing an amendment to the pending naval bill and ask that it may lie on the table. I intend to offer it before the conclusion of the discussion on the bill. I ask that the amendment may be read by the clerk.